FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 210

28 October 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Commentary on Andropov Replies to PRAVDA on INF AA 1
U.S. Attitude 'Not Serious' AA 1
[Kozyakov]
West Maintains 'Unrealistic' Stance AA 2
[Kachanov]
U.S. Media Cited AA 3
Cruise Arrival in UK Seen Slated for 1 Nov AA 3
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Oct]
NATO Removal of Theater Nuclear Warheads Scorned AA 4
'Deliberate Deception' AA 4
[Seyful-Mulyukov]
'Deceitful Maneuver' [Serov] AA 4
Public Opinion 'Swindle' AA 5
[Zhukov in PRAVDA 26 Oct]
French, UK Missile Inclusion Seen Predating 1982 AA 7
[Serov]
Soviet Objections to U.S. START Moves Detailed AA 8
[Vasilyev in NOVOYE VREMYA 21 Oct]
Polish Delegate Blames NATO for MBFR 'Stalemate' AA 12
U.S. Space Militarization Goals 'Kids' Passion' AA 13
[Burlatskiy in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 26 Oct]
Booklet 'Proves' USSR Sincere on Disarmament AA 15
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Oct]

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Deputy Ministers Condemn Grenada Intervention BB 1
Socialist Media Conference Opens in Havana BB 1
[IZVESTIYA 20 Oct]
Briefs: CEMA Statistics Commission Meets BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

UN Security Council Debate on Grenada Reported CC 1
U.S. Vetoes Resolution CC 1
U.S. 'Aggression' Condemned CC 3
[PRAVDA 27 Oct]
WFTU Statement Protests 'Attack' on Grenada CC 4
UN Delegates Discuss Disarmament Issues CC 4
[Baybakov]
UN Day Noted as Start of 'Disarmament Week' CC 5
[Editorial in IZVESTIYA 25 Oct]

U.S. Tries To Revive Pol Pot 'Corpse' at UN [Vasilets] CC 7
Soviet Delegate Addresses UNESCO Meeting [Lopatin] CC 7
Delegates to Helsinki Security Conference Cited CC 9
Bulgaria's Zhivkov Speaks at Sofia TU Meeting CC 9
Meeting's Close Noted CC 10

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan Address Shows 'Frenzied Anticommunism' A 1
TASS: Reagan Once Again Violates War Powers Act A 1
Moscow: Reagan Responsible for Beirut Deaths A 1
Kornilov Assesses Reagan Policies at 3-Year Mark A 2

CHINA

Wu Xueqian, Ilichev Continue Talks in Beijing B 1
U.S., Japan 'Fear' Normalization of USSR-PRC Ties [Mulatov] B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

'Outburst of Militarist Frenzy' in S. Korea Viewed C 1

SOUTH ASIA

U.S. Using 'Carrot and Stick' Policy in Pakistan [Sevryugin in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Oct] D 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Aliyev-Led Delegation Arrives in Vietnam E 1
Activities in Hanoi [cross-reference] E 1
Kampuchea, Anniversary of PRC UN Seat Linked [Kuzin] E 1

EASTERN EUROPE

Honecker States Support for Andropov Proposals F 1
CSSR Appeals to European Parliaments on Missiles F 1
Jaruzelski, Kadar Remarks in Warsaw Talks Cited F 1
Ustinov Greets Romanian Defense Minister Olteanu [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Oct] F 2
Shcherbitskiy Receives Hungarian Ambassador F 2
USSR Envoy Discusses Grenada With SFRY Official [TANJUG] F 3

WESTERN EUROPE

UK Fails To Condemn U.S. 'Aggression' in Grenada G 1
FRG White Paper on Security 'Unpardonable Lie' G 1
[Yakhontov in PRAVDA 22 Oct]
Greens in FRG Bundestag on Visit to Moscow G 2
To Meet Korniyenko, Zagladin [DPA] G 2
Received by Shitikov G 3
Zagladin on French Policy, Role of PCF G 3
[Paris LE MONDE 25 Oct]
Kosolapov Leads CPSU Delegation to France G 4
Science, Technology Protocol Signed With Spain G 4

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

U.S. Public's 'Anxieties' Over Lebanon Cited H 1
[Vasilyev in PRAVDA 27 Oct]
CPSU's Zagladin Quoted on Mideast Developments H 2
[Paris LE MONDE 25 Oct]
Syrian Press Reports on Beirut Blasts Cited H 2
'Signs' Point to Pershings for Israel H 3
[Belyayev in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 26 Oct]
Baghdad Radio Reports Iran on 'Offensive' H 4
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Oct]

SUB-SAHARAN AFFAIRS

U.S. Seeks To 'Sabotage' Namibia Solution J 1
[PRAVDA]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Moscow Media Hit U.S. Activity in Grenada K 1
Reagan's Cuba Charges 'Absurd' K 1
American Safety 'Pretext' K 1
U.S. Playing 'Hypocrite' K 1
'Apologia for Fist Law' K 2
[Sturua in IZVESTIYA 27 Oct]
Reagan Assertions 'Mendacious' K 3
[Andrionov]
White House 'False Arguments' K 4
[Seyful-Mulyukov]
U.S. 'Language of Bullets' K 5
Impact of Grenada Events on World Viewed K 6
Euromissile Issue Linked K 6
[Kharkov]
Nonaligned, NATO Nations React K 7
[Levchenko]
Grenada Actions Planned 'In Advance' by U.S. K 8
[Chigir]

U.S. 'Misleading' Public With 'Disinformation' K 9
Continued Resistance to U.S. Forces Noted K 10
Third Day of Opposition K 10
'Heavier' U.S. Casualties K 10
Ft Frederick Surrenders K 10
Cuban Official Gives Interview on Grenada K 11
[IZVESTIYA 27 Oct]
'Pain, Anger' of Cubans in Anti-U.S. Protest K 12
[Kozlenko]
Grenada 'Dress Rehearsal' for Nicaragua Invasion K 12
[Mikhaylov in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 27 Oct]
Grenada 'Invasion' Foreshadows War in Nicaragua K 14
[Fesunenko]
Supreme Soviet Delegation Pays Visit to Bolivia K 15
Meeting With Paz Zamora K 15
[IZVESTIYA 21 Oct]
Meeting With President K 16
[IZVESTIYA 23 Oct]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Shcherbitskiy Addresses Kharkov Award Ceremony R 1
[PRAVDA 22 Oct]
Grishin Attends Moscow Scientific Meeting R 2
Shevardnadze Praises Soviet Nationalities Policy R 2
New Kirghiz Construction Minister Appointed R 3
[SOVETSKAYA KIRGHIZIYA 28 Sep]
Bitov Mother Writes LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Editor R 3
Weather Change Hampers Rescue of Trapped Ships R 3

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

TASS Reports 26 Oct Launch of Cosmos-1506 U 1
Scientific, Technical Progress Examined U 1
Institute Director on Robotization Program U 4
[TRUD 14 Oct]

COMMENTARY ON ANDROPOV REPLIES TO PRAVDA ON INF

U.S. Attitude 'Not Serious'

LD280415 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Commentary by Vladyslav Kozyakov]

[Text] There is no lack of goodwill on the Soviet side as far as the Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe are concerned. The Soviet leader, Yuriy Andropov, has once again confirmed this in his answers to questions put to him by the newspaper PRAVDA. He put forward several new proposals to promote the talks and to reach a mutually acceptable agreement based on equality and equal security. The proposals are concrete and businesslike. First, if there are no new American medium-range missiles in Western Europe the Soviet Union is prepared to have only about 140 launchers for its SS-20 missiles in the European part of the country. That is appreciably fewer than the number of medium-range missile launchers that Britain and France have, provided of course that in such a case there will be an equality of warheads on the missiles of the Soviet Union on the one hand and of Britain and France on the other.

Second, if an agreement on limiting arms in Europe is reached and comes into force, the deployment of SS-20 missiles in the eastern areas of the USSR will be stopped from that moment. And the Soviet Union shall firmly proceed from this provided the United States will not site new medium-range missiles in areas from which they could reach the eastern part of the Soviet territory.

Third, the Soviet side is prepared to display additional flexibility in fixing equal overall levels for the USSR and NATO of medium-range nuclear capable aircraft within mutually acceptable numerical limits. In other words, to meet Washington's request for the American airborne systems in Europe the Soviet Union is ready to increase substantially limits for medium-range nuclear capable aircraft it proposed earlier. This is despite the fact that Soviet medium-range aircraft are not based in other countries from which they could reach the territory of the United States.

Such are the new Soviet proposals put forward by Yuriy Andropov in his answer to PRAVDA's questions published today throughout the world. The proposals are aimed at seeking mutually acceptable agreement. As Yuriy Andropov pointed out, if the United States displayed a real desire to reach a mutually acceptable agreement, framing an agreement would not take much time. The major problem now is the prevention of the planned deployment of American nuclear missiles in Western Europe. If the United States discarded plans of deploying its missiles by the date announced this would make it possible to continue the talks in Geneva. In such a case the Soviet Union could even now begin reducing its SS-4 missiles, of which it has over 200. And in case of reaching an agreement a considerable part of the present SS-20 missiles would likewise be scrapped. On the other hand, if the new American missiles appear in Western Europe this will make a continuation of the Geneva talks impossible. This was quite clearly stressed by the Soviet Leader, Yuriy Andropov.

Now what was the reaction of the American Administration to the Soviet statement? Judging from the remarks made by Secretary of State George Shultz in Paris, the American unrealistic and one-sided position remains unchanged. He actually advocated the planned deployment of American Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe, and again tried to mislead the public, asserting that the United States will continue to negotiate after deployment. Meanwhile the State Department in Washington issued a statement trying actually to dismiss new Soviet initiatives aimed at reacing mutually acceptable solutions.

This is another indication that the administration's attitude towards the Geneva talks is not serious and it does its utmost to continue preparation for the deployment of new missiles in Western Europe. No wonder that the public in both the United States and Europe continue to voice its vigorous protests against the dangerous policy pursued by the Reagan administration.

West Maintains 'Unrealistic' Stance

LD271235 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] The replies given by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov to PRAVDA questions are at the center of the attention of the world public. The foreign mass media note that the initiative of the Soviet Union at the Geneva talks opens up a real path toward lowering world tension. At the microphone is our commentator Yevgeniy Kachanov:

Really, comrades, even the very first reactions to Comrade Andropov's answers show that the world public, and especially in the West European countries, is well informed about the Soviet position. This is especially noticeable at a time when Disarmament Week is in progress. It was called on the initiative of the United Nations and the World Peace Council. Millions of people call for an end to be put to the dangerous spiral in the arms race begun on Washington's initiative. I have in mind the deployment planned for the end of this year in West Europe of new U.S. medium-range missiles -- that is, the main question at the Soviet-U.S. talks now taking place in Geneva. And as Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov said, there is unfortunately no progress toward accord at these talks. The situation there remains deadlocked. And the reason remains the same: By using this deployment of new missiles the United States wants to guarantee itself considerable military advantage over the USSR.

But let me recall, comrades, that for several years now there has been approximate equality in Europe as regards medium-range nuclear weapons. And at the same time the fantasy is being put about that the deployment of the latest Pershing II and cruise missiles is intended to counter the Soviet missiles known in the West as SS-20's.

I would recall at this point the conference of leaders of the main NATO powers, the United States, Great Britain, the FRG and France, which was held on the island of Guadeloupe in January 1979 -- that is 11 months before the famous NATO decision on rearmament. In Guadeloupe it was said, firstly, that as a result of the Soviet adoption of SS-20 missiles, the level of threat for NATO -- those are their words -- will not be significantly increased. And secondly, they already agreed there on the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in order -- and I quote -- to expand NATO's options for action.

Thus, as far back as January 1979 they began to steer a course toward achieving military superiority over the USSR. And soon afterwards there began a frantic propaganda campaign to depict the quite normal procedure of modernizing Soviet missiles and exchanging one type by a newer one as what they call a sharp increase in Soviet nuclear might.

In reality, as Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov has said, the replaced SS-5 missiles had a range not less than that of the SS-20's and the capacity of the warhead was much greater in the former than in the latter. Of course the United States knew that, but it was not part of Washington's plan for the broad public to know it.

It is still just the same old one-sided and unrealistic White House position of which I have already spoken that has received and continues to receive the propaganda support of the big press in the West. Nonetheless, as Comrade Andropov has pointed out, the Soviet Union is not giving up the quest for accord until by its actions the United States makes accord impossible.

At the Geneva talks our government is showing real flexibility and does not just limit itself to words about flexibility, as the U.S. side does. To date all Soviet proposals have been rejected outright while each new White House confirmation of the self-same blind-alley position, that is plans to deploy new missiles, has been presented more or less as a manifestation of political wisdom. What this kind of wisdom may lead to is well understood by the inhabitants of West European countries, and not only West European countries, who are marching these days under antiwar slogans.

The Soviet Union, as Comrade Andropov has pointed out, has given convincing proof over the 2 years of the talks that it is ready for a bold solution in order to lift the nuclear danger from Europe and to strengthen security on our continent and throughout the world.

The proposals which we have put forward, including those which you have read in today's PRAVDA, envisage a wide range of possible measures from substantial reductions in Europe, tactical as well as medium-range. They contain all the necessary elements for mutually acceptable accord without encroaching on anyone's interests, either of the USSR and its allies, or the United States or the West European states. And it is to be thought that the guarantee of progress at the Geneva talks lies in a serious attitude by the United States to these proposals.

U.S. Media Cited

LD271059 Moscow TASS in English 0745 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 27 TASS -- Mass media in the USA widely comment on Yuri Andropov's answers to questions asked by the newspaper PRAVDA.

THE NEW YORK TIMES front-pages a report of its Moscow correspondent on this subject. It says that Yuriy Andropov suggested certain additional steps on the way to agreement with the United States on medium-range missiles. At the same time, the newspaper writes, the Soviet leader pointed out that the appearance of new American missiles in West Europe would make the continuation of the current Geneva talks impossible.

Stressing that the Soviet Union will not back down on its demands that the balance of forces in medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe should not be upset, Yuriy Andropov made three proposals. The newspaper makes special mention of the Soviet Union's readiness to have in Europe approximately 140 launchers for SS-20 missiles.

The ABC television company described as "interesting" the proposals made in Yuriy Andropov's answers.

CRUISE ARRIVAL IN UK SEEN SLATED FOR 1 NOV

PM251528 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Oct 83 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Hastening to Deploy"]

[Text] London, 24 Oct -- The first consignment of new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles is due in England on 1 November, London's THE GUARDIAN has reported. According to the newspaper, nuclear-armed cruise missiles will be delivered by U.S. Air Force transport planes on that day to the U.S. air base at Greenham Common.

According to THE GUARDIAN report, amidst mass public protests at the deployment of more U.S. nuclear weapons in England, the Conservative cabinet plans in the immediate future to move in "several battalions of British soldiers" to protect the Greenham Common base. This will be done in order to prevent possible attempts by residents of the Greenham Common "peace camp" to blockade the base.

As is well known, according to NATO plans, 160 cruise missiles will be deployed on British territory. The British are increasingly opposed to these sinister plans becoming a reality.

NATO REMOVAL OF THEATER NUCLEAR WARHEADS SCORNED

'Deliberate Deception'

LD272338 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1940 GMT 27 Oct 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] A session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group opened in Ottawa today, in which the defense ministers of this Western military group are participating. It is reported that in Ottawa there will be discussion of questions connected with preparations for the deployment of the new medium-range U.S. missiles in West Germany, Britain, and Italy.

It has become known in press circles that a decision will be taken at this meeting on the removal from the armories of obsolete operational-tactical nuclear munitions that the United States has on West European territory and its replacement with more effective ammunition. The NATO leaders, as can be seen from reports in the Western press, intend to exploit the so-called withdrawal from Europe of obsolete warheads for theater nuclear weapons with the aim of neutralizing the antiwar movement, which is protesting against the deployment of the new U.S. nuclear missiles on the European Continent.

Prominent U.S. specialists admit that in the coming 5 years all the nuclear warheads [boyepripasy] that the United States has in Europe -- 6 or 7 thousand units -- will be replaced by new ones, including warheads for the new Pershing II and cruise missiles. Thus the total number of nuclear warheads will not decrease; it will even grow. This deliberate deception by the United States is aimed at ill-informed people.

A few days ago THE WASHINGTON POST reported that the new warheads are already packed and ready for delivery by air to their completed positions in Britain and West Germany. There, and in another three European countries, the paper notes, the foundations have been laid for the deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles in the next 5 years.

'Deceitful Maneuver'

LD280338 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1350 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow, 27 Oct (TASS) -- TASS political observer Vladimir Serov writes:

The growing movement in Western Europe against the deployment in a number of West European countries of new American first-strike nuclear missiles is creating serious obstacles to the implementation of these most dangerous plans and is forcing the NATO leadership and this bloc's propaganda services to resort to various maneuvers in order to weaken public protest.

One such maneuver is the decision taken by NATO strategists and widely publicized beforehand to be officially announced at the session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group opening today in Ottawa. It is a question, as is being widely reported, of a "plan to withdraw from Europe about 1,500 warheads for nuclear weapons in the theater of military actions."

If one looks more attentively at this decision, one cannot but come to the conclusion that in actual fact it is an attempt to pass off the removal of obsolete NATO nuclear weapons as an "important step in the sphere of disarmament." It is proposed, in particular, to remove about 1,000 obsolete nuclear artillery shells, which should have been withdrawn back in 1977, and about 300 atomic mines, the decision to remove them having been taken back in 1980, etc. In short, as the London OBSERVER put it, it is a matter of "scrapping old junk."

Moreover, on the admission of American experts themselves, in the course of the next 5 years all the 6,000-7,000 units of American nuclear munitions existing in Europe will be replaced by new ones, including warheads for the new Pershing II and cruise missiles. It is also planned to replace old nuclear artillery shells with neutron shells, which in the meantime are being stockpiled on U.S. territory. Thus, the overall numbers of nuclear munitions will not diminish, rather it will increase. Hence this is a case of elementary trickery, reckoning on people being uninformed.

The announcement of the fictious "reduction" of American nuclear arsenals in Europe has been deliberately timed for the fall in order to influence public opinion, which is deeply alarmed at the stationing of new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe scheduled for the end of 1983. "NATO officials," says THE WASHINGTON POST, "hope thereby to quell protests against the arms buildup."

Using pseudo-peaceloving "gestures" the NATO leaders are seeking to reduce the intensity of the demonstrations against turning Western Europeans into the nuclear hostages of Washington. It is far from coincidental that the NATO summit group that took the above-mentioned decision the other day is headed by Richard Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defense for international security policy, who is a convinced opponent of arms control agreements.

Many political observers believe, however, that such attempts as using improper means cannot mislead the participants in the anti-missile movement, who can see through this deceitful maneuver by the NATO strategists and propagandists.

Public Opinion 'Swindle'

PM261704 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 83 First Edition p 5

[Yuriy Zhukov "Political Observer's Notes": "Swindle!"]

[Text] The Pentagon and the NATO staff are preparing a new unscrupulous operation aimed at confusing people who are alarmed at the sharp intensification of the nuclear threat in Europe and portraying R. Reagan, who is dreaming of spending an additional 4 years in the White House, in the role of a peacemaker.

A few days ago a certain "high-ranking American official" (as usual, he forbade journalists from naming him!) met with representatives of the press in Brussels after a session of the North Atlantic Council and told them that "NATO is planning to dismantle short-range nuclear means in Europe."

"Diplomatic circles" (also anonymous!) at once declared that "a plan for the withdrawal of approximately 1,500 units of tactical weapons" will be "officially submitted by a defense minister of the allied countries at the NATO Nuclear Planning Group session at the end of this month."

In passing, as is the custom, a new "canard" was launched that, according to the intention of psychological warfare specialists, is to produce an irresistiable impression on uninformed people. A certain "responsible American figure" lied with dashing aplomb, without blushing, and alleged that "since the beginning of the seventies the United States has already reduced by approximately 25 percent the might of its nuclear arsenal in megatons by liquidating (!) 8,000 units of arms," while during the same period "the Soviet Union has maintained the numbers of its arms almost unchanged, while at the same time substantially increasing the might of its missiles in megatons."

Of course, this anonymous "responsible American figure" did not cite any proof of his stunning allegation, not that any proof exists in nature. The intention here is simple: It was Goebbels who said that the more barefaced the lie, the greater the impression it will produce....

It is characteristic that at a press conference in the FRG, government spokesman P. Boenisch immediately caught in midair, as the saying goes, the ball thrown by the "high-ranking American official," declaring that Bonn "voices deep satisfaction in connection with President Reagan's intention to liquidate 1,500 units of U.S. tactical nuclear weapons in Europe." And, making his own contribution to the new myth about Washington's love of peace, P. Boenisch went on to add with ardor:

"It is by no means a question of some obsolete types of weapons but of modern (!) ones." And, going on to attack the peace champions struggling these days against the deployment of new American nuclear missiles, he declared that the FRG Government "appeals to those who demand unilateral (?!) steps in the area of arms reduction to take cognizance of these measures by the West and demand similar actions from the USSR."

But it is not for nothing that a folk saying says that lies have cockroach legs -- they will break at any moment. It turned out that in Brussels and Bonn they had overlooked the fact that as early as 9 October the British conservative weekly THE OBSERVER, which not even the CIA would venture to accuse of being published with Soviet money, revealed the real reason for the Pentagon and NATO operation that is now being publicized.

Reporting that "NATO is about to announce the 'scrapping' of 1,500 nuclear warheads as a move designed to have a significant impact on public opinion as the date for deploying cruise and Pershing missiles in Europe approaches," THE OBSERVER declared:

"In practice this move will mainly help only to clear out old junk."

Catch that? Old junk, and not "modern types of arms," as Herr Boenisch took the liberty of declaring!

"The decision to scrap the 1,500 warheads," the British weekly argued, "is not at all what it seems. All these warheads are obsolete and can in no way be compared with the new cruise and Pershing II missiles."

Proof? Here it is.

First, THE OBSERVER reported, it is a question of 200 Nike-Hercules antiaircraft nuclear missiles, which are already 20 years old. Their tactical performance has long failed to meet NATO's requirements.

Second, more than 300 old nuclear demolition mines, which have also "long been considered useless," are destined for scrap.

Third, and finally, "it is planned to withdraw 1,000 obsolete nuclear artillery shells," which American generals intended to "scrap" back in 1977.

And another report of considerable significance carried by the British conservative weekly: "Some of the warheads that are planned to be withdrawn will later be secretly replaced by others when the fuss over cruise missiles has died down." It is a question, in particular, of preparing to replace the old nuclear artillery shells with neutron shells, which are now being manufactured in the United States and being stored there for the time being.

As Ian Mather, THE OBSERVER's Washington correspondent, explained, the decision to clear out the "old junk" was made back in April 1980, but it was hushed up for release later, when it would have maximum impact. "It was believed," the British weekly elaborated, "that after the liquidation of old warheads it will be easier for public opinion to reconcile itself to cruise missiles."

This assessment of Pentagon and NATO intentions is shared by E. Bahr, member of the Presidium of the Board of the FRG's Social Democratic Party. He said that the move conceived in Washington "is to prepare the peoples of West Europe psychologically to reconcile themselves to the upcoming deployment of new American medium-range weapons and, at the same time, to prepare the political ground for the deployment of the new missiles here."

Let us add: After the replacement of the "old junk" with new warheads their total number, far from dropping, will actually increase!

Thus, it is a question of a most elementary and flagrant swindle of public opinion in the crude style characteristic of the activity of the American psychological warfare services.

FRENCH, UK MISSILE INCLUSION SEEN PREDATING 1982

LD272357 Moscow TASS in English 2257 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 27 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Vladimir Serov writes:

In an attempt to present in a false light the Soviet Union's stand on the issue of limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe, Bonn's official representatives do not stop even at a crude distortion of the facts. Thus, FRG Foreign Minister Genscher claims that the Soviet Union for the first time raised the question of taking the British and French nuclear forces into consideration in the general balance of nuclear weapons in Europe only in 1982, while prior to that it allegedly considered this question to be not a topical one.

To put it mildly, such claims do not correspond to fact. In the first place, taking into account the forward based weapons of the USA, as well as of the nuclear forces of Britain and France, was the Soviet Union's demand from the very start. It was way back at the SALT-2 talks that the Soviet side put forward the legitimate demand for taking these forces into account, but the American side opposed it.

These nuclear weapons, which were left then outside the bracket, were to be discussed at SALT-3 talks. But, as has been learnt now, at a meeting in Guadeloupe in 1979, the leaders of the USA in its closest NATO allies reached agreement that the USA would appear at the Geneva talks alone, so as to be able, by referring to the bilateral character of the talks, to exclude the British and French nuclear weapons from calculation and set in motion the medacious "Soviet missile monopoly" in Europe proposition.

Second, the Soviet representative repeatedly and long before the year of 1982 explained to representatives of the West, including the FRG foreign minister, the Soviet stand on that issue. It was stressed that the Soviet Union cannot help taking into consideration the nuclear weapons of Britian and France targeted on it and on its allies. This was pointed out also during the meeting in Moscow in 1980 between USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Ustinov and Chief of the USSR General Staff Nikolay Ogarkov and the then FRG Chancellor Schmidt with the participation also of Mr. Genscher. It is strange that he has forgotten that.

This question was also raised at the meeting between Marshal Ogarkov and American senators Cranston and Mathias, who visited the Soviet Union in 1981.

Appropriate explanations to this effect were given also during Leonid Brezhnev's official visit to the FRG in 1981. How possibly could the FRG foreign minister forget about it? Could he have failed to take note of the fact that in the interview given by Leonid Brezhnev on the eve of that visit to the DER SPIEGEL magazine details were cited of the balance of medium-range nuclear forces in Europe, in which there is rough parity between the USSR and NATO? It must be pointed out that the weapons of Britain and France were counted among the nuclear forces of NATO, along with the forward based weapons of the USA.

How can one say in the light of the above-mentioned facts that it was only in 1982 that the Soviet Union raised the question about it? One cannot help asking whether this is deliberate juggling with the facts in order to try to discredit the USSR's explicit and consistent stand and try to justify the West's unrealistic, obstructionist policy at the Geneva talks?

SOVIET OBJECTIONS TO U.S. START MOVES DETAILED

PM271521 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 43 21 Oct 83 pp 5-7

[V. Vasilyev article: "What Lies Behind Washington's 'Flexibility': On the START Talks in Geneva"]

[Text] The Soviet-American START talks have always been of great significance. While reflecting the general state of relations between the two countries, they, in their turn, exert a direct influence on both these relations and the whole political climate on earth. After all, the questions that are being resolved are whether unchecked stockpiling of these most terrible weapons will continue even further; whether the latest systems, which can fundamentally overturn the notion of strategic stability and the very possibility of effectively limiting and reducing nuclear weapons, will emerge; and whether the arms race will be stopped. In the end, it is a question of whether or not we will succeed in preventing nuclear catastrophe.

The fifth round of the talks that has begun in Geneva is taking on a decisive nature. This is related to the actual course of the talks, where the sides' stances and intentions have become apparent. It is also related to features of the present situation in the world arena, where, through the fault of the Washington administration, a worsening of relations between the USSR and the United States has taken place, and where its desire to achieve world hegemony makes one doubt whether Washington has any restraints capable of stopping it from overstepping the mark at which any sensible person would stop. Finally, there is one further circumstance that also has a direct dearing on the talks. That is the intention to deploy new American missiles in Europe, which would inevitably bring about an alteration in the balance of forces not only on a regional scale, but on a global scale too.

The statement by U.S. President R. Reagan with regard to the beginning of the new round of the Soviet-American START talks repeatedly speaks of the American stance's flexibility. It maintains, for example, that the American side has already shown "extraordinary flexibility" during the talks and now intends again to show "considerable flexibility."

However, one only has to look carefully at the kind of baggage with which the American delegation set off for Geneva for the untenability of the discourse about flexibility aimed, allegedly at breaking the deadlock at the talks and opening up the way to achieving agreement, to become clear. It is easy to appreciate that only proposals leading to a mutually acceptable and equitable decision may be considered as flexible. But neither equitability nor a desire to agree to a real reduction and limitation of strategic weapons have been evident in the American stance. Nor have they been evident in Reagan's vague discussion of new American initiatives, which up to now even American experts on the disarmament problem have been completely unable to understand.

It emerges for the American President's statement that the American delegations' stance will be constructed within the framework of the "earlier principles" by which they were guided during the four preceding rounds.

As for principles, all the experience of Soviet-American talks shows that the achievement of mutually acceptable constructive agreements is possible only when equality and identical security are respected. If the two sides adhere to this approach, agreement is possible, as the example of the SALT I and SALT II talks showed. It is on these principles that the Soviet side's stance is built. It pursues a single aim: the aim of considerably reducing the strategic weapons arsenals presently possessed, closing off the way to their further improvement, and maintaining the present equality, but at a lower level.

If demands are put forward which infringe equality and contradict the principle of identical security, the talks become deadlocked. It is precisely because of this that the American side's principles, to which the U.S. President referred, are unrealistic. They are dictated by a desire to break the existing parity and achieve unilateral military advantages for the United States.

One may understand the essence of the matter better by recalling certain features of the strategic arms question. Above all, it has to be borne in mind that today these arms are made up of three components: ground-based ICBM's, SLBM's, and heavy bombers. Each side, because of geographical, political, economic, and other factors, has adhered to its own approach to the ratios within this triad. The USSR has more land-based missiles, whereas the United States has more SLBM's and heavy bombers. At the same time, in terms of nuclear munitions [boyepripasy] within the strategic forces there is a patent predominance on these munitions, whereas the Soviet Union has about 7,000.

There exists on the whole an approximate equality in the strategic arms field; and this is an effective factor in maintaining peace. But it is precisely this equality which does not suit the present Washington administration, which is seeking to secure a dominant position in the world for the United States, heedless of the interests of other countries and peoples.

The "earlier principles" at the talks that are spoken about in Reagan's statement are based on an artificial division of strategic arms into those which are the "most destabilizing" and those which are "less dangerous." Washington places Soviet land-based missiles in the first category and American submarine-launched missiles and heavy bombers in the second.

During the preceding rounds of the talks the American side insisted that the USSR and the United States should reduce the total number of warheads on missiles to 5,000 units on each side. Half of these would be accounted for by land-based missiles, and the other half by submarine-launched missiles. Here, so to speak, is the crux of the matter. With this approach there is nothing left of either equality or identical security. After all, land-based missiles account for 70 percent of the Soviet Union's warheads, whereas for the United States this figure is only 20 percent. With the American option the USSR, even by the Pentagon's calculations, would have to reduce the number of warheads on the missiles on which its strategic defense potential is based by more than half. Meanwhile, the United States would obtain the possibility of building up both the number of warheads on its land-based ICBM's and the number of missiles themselves, including the latest missiles: the MX, each of which carries 10 warheads, and the single-unit Midgetman.

This alone is enough to show Washington's real approach to the talks. Its aim is to reduce on the Soviet side the most modern kinds of armaments on which its defense potential is based. The United States, however, reserves the right to comprehensively improve and build up land-based missiles.

Let us now look at submarines -- the second strategic arms component, where the United States has a 150-percent superiority in warheads. And here it is proposed to retain 2,500 warheads each. The United States could easily reach this level by the reduction -- planned beforehand -- of certain old systems. This matter turns out to be quite different for the USSR. Its submarines carry just 2,000 warheads. It turns out that the Soviet Union would either have to agree to the United States' retaining considerable superiority in SLBM's, or start extensive construction of new missile-carrying submarines.

The case of heavy bombers is exactly the same. And here, as we know, the United States has superiority many times over. The American press refers to Washington's readiness to agree to 400 heavy bombers on each side. But the United States already has 346 heavy bombers operational, and another 228 in reserve. In addition, a program to build the latest B-1B heavy bombers equipped with long-range cruise missiles [krylatyye rakety dalnego radiusa deystviya] is in progress. The Soviet Union does not have this number of heavy bombers. And if the American proposal were followed, the Soviet Union would again either have to agree to the United States' retaining a considerable superiority in heavy bombers, or would have to start building hundreds of heavy bombers of its own.

The result would be that the United States would end up having far more charges than the Soviet Union. In order to correct the imbalance in some way the Soviet Union would have to reshape its strategic forces according to the American pattern. This is what the "equality" being proposed by Reagan looks like in reality. The Soviet Union is naturally unable to agree to these deliberately unacceptable conditions.

And one further thing. In talking about reducing nuclear arms, Washington has left aside the question of long-range cruise missiles [krylatyye rakety bolshoy dalnosti]. At the same time, the Pentagon's plans envisage the creation of more than 21,000 cruise missiles of all kinds of basing modes. In this event, even if agreement on reducing ballistic missiles and bombers were reached, an overall reduction in the strategic arms arsenal would not take place. On the contrary, it would be increased still further.

Perhaps Washington has now realized the inequitability and futility of its stance and has really decided to change it and show flexibility? This is not evident from Reagan's statement. On the contrary, what follows from it is that the American side will continue to stick to its former intention of achieving a reduction of Soviet land-based missiles, which Washington designates as the "most dangerous, high-speed systems."

President R. Reagan speaks of U.S. readiness to introduce quotas for heavy bombers and cruise missiles. Such a change from the former stance could only be welcomed. But a number of questions arise, without a reply to which it is difficult to recognize this initiative as being a positive one. First, what kind of quota is being thought of? If it is just hundreds of bombers again, only no longer B-52's, but B-1B's and Stealths, then there is no progress here at all. Nor is it clear what quota for air-launched cruise missiles is being thought of. If it is thousands of missiles, then, instead of a reduction in strategic arms, an increase will take place. Moreover, there is the question of dealing with land-based and sea-based cruise missiles. Or are no limitations at all envisaged for them? Finally, the idea of "exchanging" Soviet land-based missiles for American bombers that is creeping into the Washington administration's discussions cannot fail to cause alarm.

Analyzing the new Reagan initiatives, THE NEW YORK TIMES came to the well-founded conclusion that, as before, a change in the structure of its strategic arms will be required of the Soviet Union. "This," the newspaper observes, "is not the way to agreement. It is just one more means of demanding a sharp reduction in the number of Soviet land-based missiles."

The idea of linking reduction to modernization is also being dubbed a Reagan initiative. Several explanations on this score have appeared in the American press. They point out that upon removing old missiles or warheads the sides could replace them by a smaller number of new ones. But in reality this means that Washington is trying to secure the USSR's consent to continuing the arms race in the qualitative sphere. This would also mean the Soviet Union's consent to the planned reequipping of American strategic armaments with new systems of land-based and submarine-launched missiles and heavy bombers carrying long-range cruise missiles. The warheads on them would have a greater strike accuracy and greater destructive power than those which Washington wants to replace.

Thus, the new initiatives of which the U.S. President speaks do not promise progress at the talks. It is only in the attempts to gain unilateral military advantages that flexibility is being shown. But this is an unsuitable basis for agreement.

The Soviet Union firmly rejects the American side's unequal and unconstructive approach. It proposes a truly equal and truly significant reduction in strategic arms: reducing the total number of delivery vehicles by 25 percent, leaving each side with 1,800 units. In the process all the components of the strategic forces -- land-based ICBM's, ballistic missiles, and heavy bombers -- would be reduced. Moreover, by banning the deployment of cruise missiles new channels in the strategic arms race would be closed.

While proposing a realistic way to achieve a mutually acceptable agreement on limiting and reducing strategic arms, the USSR cannot disregard the U.S. actions aimed at deploying new American missiles in Europe. The United States already has hundreds of forward-based nuclear systems in Europe at the moment that can deliver their lethal cargo to the territory of the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies. These systems are in no way counterbalanced, as the Soviet Union has no such weapons sited at the U.S. borders. It is not difficult to appreciate that the deployment of Pershing II and long-range cruise missiles in West European countries would signify a direct increase in the U.S. strategic potential. It is also clear that this development of events would inevitably lead to a complication of the START talks.

The Soviet leadership has stated that it sees no desire on the American side to really concern itself with solving the problem of limiting and reducing strategic arms. If Washington continues to gamble on breaking the parity and gaining military advantages, the Soviet Union will come up with an appropriate response. It is faced with the necessity of taking appropriate measures to strengthen its defense capability, including the deployment of appropriate new strategic systems. The only aim of these measures is to prevent the disturbance of the prevailing balance of forces.

But the path of competing in the arms race is not the path that the Soviet Union wants to follow. "The question," Yu.V. Andropov's statement observes, "of what sort of line to pursue in international affairs and in the present acute situation does not arise in the Soviet leadership. Our course is, as previously, aimed at maintaining and strengthening peace, reducing tension, curbing the arms race, and broadening and deepening cooperation between states."

This line embodied in specific proposals aimed at achieving agreement on limiting and reducing strategic arms. The Soviet Union considers that a mutually acceptable decision can be found through strict observance of the principle of equality and identical security at the Geneva talks. This was stated with complete clarity at the session of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee held in Sofia on 13 and 14 October.

It is not by Washington's words about flexibility but by its deeds that the peoples are judging its approach to this problem, a problem which is of the greatest significance for peace and the peoples' security.

POLISH DELEGATE BLAMES NATO FOR MBFR'S 'STALEMATE'

LD271558 Moscow TASS in English 1416 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Vienna October 27 TASS -- S. Pszygodski, the leader of the Polish delegation, addressed today's plenary meeting at the talks on mutual force reductions in Central Europe. As the journalists were told, he said that the present international situation and the concrete state of affairs at the Vienna talks give no grounds for marking the tenth anniversary of these talks, which falls due on October 30, and make it necessary for the negotiators to redouble their efforts to achieve concrete results.

The Polish representative analysed concrete factors accounting for such a prolonged stalemate at the Vienna talks. The main thing, he said, was the permanent striving of the NATO states to impose on socialist countries such unequal commitments as would diminish their security. What is more, the NATO countries take, from year to year, actions cutting across the main aim of the Vienna talks. These are, first of all, programmes for building up nuclear and conventional armaments of NATO countries in order to achieve military superiority over the Warsaw Treaty states.

The leader of the Polish delegation stressed that deployment of new American medium-range missiles in West Europe would undoubtedly further worsen the political climate, sharply aggravate the international situation and increase the danger of nuclear catastrophe. Tbis would also have an adverse effect on the Vienna talks.

S. Pszygodski criticized the unconstructive position of the West aimed at securing one-sided advantages for itself, and showed convincingly that the negative transformation of this position was markedly speeded up after the adoption of NATO"s "double-track decision." This found expression in the Western draft agreement of 1982 which cannot be used as a basis for an equitable, mutually accpetable agreement.

The Polish represenrative stressed that throughout the Vienna talks the Warsaw Treaty states have displayed realism, a sense of responsibility and readiness to look for a reasonable and just compromise. Their proposals of February 17 and the draft of a comprehensive agreement on June 23, 1983, contain everything necessary for breaking the deadlock at the talks and for making a practical start on the reduction of troops of NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries in Central Europe.

But the Western negotiators, using various far-fetched pretexts, continue to follow their tactics of artificially dragging out negotiations. They avoid, as before, taking decisions on basic questions of troop and arms reduction and are trying to limit the matter to a discussion of individual aspects, as for instance control measures.

If the Western side, the Polish delegate said in conclusion, gives at last a constructive reply to the proposals of the socialist countries, the way to bringing the positions of the sides closer togehter and achieving agreement will be cleared. The question of progress at the Vienna talks is long overdue. Its solution depends exclusively on whether or not the West will display this time political will to get the Vienna talks out of the deadlock it created and to work out mutually acceptable decisions.

The Soviet delegation circulated among the negotiators the text of the answers given by Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to questions asked by the newspaper PRAVDA.

U.S. SPACE MILITARIZATION GOALS 'KIDS' PASSION'

PM251527 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Oct 83 p 9

["Political Observer's Opinion" by Fedor Burlatskiy under the rubric "International Life": "Star Wars. The Space Program: a Casus Belli?"]

[Text] The White House and Capitol Hill are beginning the discussion of a 5-year program for the development of space-based weapons. Its initial cost is $17-18 billion and its long-term cost at least $40-50 billion. The program has been drawn up by a group of scientists and political advisers under the leadership of Defense Secretary C. Weinberger. Thus President Ronald Reagan is beginning a new round of U.S. militarization. U.S. observers laconically and expressively describe the current plans as the President's "star wars."

Meanwhile the international public in the United States itself and in West Europe is beginning to deliberate more and more actively about what is promised by mankind's entry into the military space age: consolidation of security or its final destruction.

Our country's leader Yu.V. Andropov has accurately defined the Soviet position on this question in his statement. Space weapons, if they are developed, would undoubtedly become a most dangerous factor of destabilization. Suppose, for example, that the Americans manage to be the first to develop an efficient space weapons system -- to launch in orbit 400 satellites armed with nuclear and laser guns -- they would hardly be able to resist the temptation to deliver the first strike. This, in turn, would place the USSR face to face with a new military and political dilemma. In other words, space weapons -- the casus belli.

In response to my article "War Games" (LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 10 August 1983) the foreign commentators attempted to dispute this conclusion. But in contrast to the U.S. leaders, who make no secret of the fact that they are seeking military superiority over the USSR through the militarization of space, these commentators hold themselves to be liberals or even pacifists. They pretend to believe that space weapons, as opposed to strategic weapons, will be not a tool of attack but a means of defense.

In an article titled "Yu. Andropov's Space Diplomacy," the Swiss newspaper NEUE ZUERCHER ZEITUNG presents in sufficient detail the basic ideas of the article "War Games." "It is completely obvious," the newspaper writes, "that the author's attention is focused not only on the threat of declaring war; the basic emphasis of his article is on the dramatization of space weapons whose use, in his opinion, would have such catastrophic consequences that the tragedies of Troy, Carthage, and Hiroshima would pale in comparison and the terrifying pictures of the future painted by Wells and Kafka's nightmarish visions would fade away. Burlatskiy describes with profound moral indignation how one fine day robots will be able to determine the fate of mankind." This is followed by the conclusion: "Thus, Yu. Andropov's space initiative appears to us to be a propaganda maneuver calculated to persuade Washington to talk."

To persuade Washington to talk.... What is reprehensible about that? Does the newspaper seriously think that even talks about the prevention of the militarization of space could be dangerous? Does the newspaper really believe that "star wars" can strengthen anyone's security -- bet it the United States, West Europe, or Switzerland itself?

Another response, this time from Wiesbaden (FRG), has been sent on behalf of some kind of "European Workers Party." Its heading reads: "Beam Weapons: The Soviets Are Threatening a Nuclear Strike." The problem is immediately turned, as we can see, upside down. Everything is transposed: The USSR is actually proposing to ban beam weapons and any other weapons in space while the United States is planning the development of such weapons. "Burlatskiy," the response says, "a fierce champion of freezing nuclear weapons, who personally opposed the 'European Workers Party' committee in Minneapolis on 23 March, writes that the development of the new U.S. strategy poses a new dilemna for the Russians. He threatens a preemptive strike by the Russians in the following words: 'Space weapons are undoubtedly the casus beli of nuclear war." In other words, instead of accepting Reagan's proposal for the joint development of beam weapons, which the Soviet Union is in any case developing secretly, Burlatskiy threatens a preemptive strike by the Russians."

On reading these lines, I did not know whether to be indignant or to laugh at the amusing and absurd remarks by its authors -- the matrimonial symbiosis of an American (LaRush) and his German wife Helga (Tsepp-LaRush), writing on behalf of the nonexistent party's committee. Let us pay no attentnion to their petty pretensions, but turn back to the heart of the matter.

No one has been or will be able to refute the conclusion that space weapons are one of the most dangerous factors disturbing the international stability. This stability has been and still remains an important guarantee against a thermonuclear conflict. Furthermore, who has given or can actually give a guarantee that the incipient plans for satellite ABM defense systems will not turn into satellite laser and nuclear attack systems tomorrow? Any serious physicist would confirm that this is a completely feasible matter. For the White House the important thing is to make a start on the implementation of its space program. And later -- later everything will roll fast downhill in the direction of destabilization.

People say that "star wars" have really stirred R. Reagan's imagination. If this is so, it could be worthwhile proposing to the U.S. President a quieter version of "star wars," which would calm the spirit, caress the audiovisual senses, and not generate fear in the pit of the stomach -- and all this simultaneously. Why not, for example, invite U.S. actor Gregory Peck and our Mikhail Ulyanov, and at the same time maybe Englishman Laurence Olivier with I. Smoktunovskiy and A. Mironov with J.-P. Belmondo to make together a movie on some outer space subject, for example, "Star Wars Between Earthlings and the Interplanetary Evil Empire?" Then all of us earthlings could enjoy the "star wars" without risking their trnasformation into a nuclear conflict. I rather liked the phrase from an American commentary: "Kids Playing at War." Could the cinema be the best modern form of satisfying this kids' passion?...

BOOKLET 'PROVES' USSR SINCERE ON DISARMAMENT

PM251454 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Oct 83 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed Review: "Disarmament: Who Is Against It?"]

[Text] "The arms race can and must be halted," reads the statement by Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. "Mankind deserves a better fate than to live in a conflict-racked world groaning beneath the weight of lethal weapons."

The booklet "Disarmament: Who Is Against It?" just published by the Military Publishing House [Voyenizdat] deals with the problems of limiting the arms race and the Soviet Union's struggle to avert an arms race, secure disarmament, and increase international security. This booklet objectively examines two approaches to the problem of limiting nuclear and conventional weapons -- the Soviet and American, Warsaw Pact and NATO countries' approach. Attention is, naturally, focused on the Soviet and U.S. stances. They are presented in an extremely detailed and well-argued manner. Comparing them, the reader will find convincing answers to the questions: who, in fact, is working for a constructive accord and who is blocking talks? The facts cited in the booklet prove incontrovertibly that for the Soviet Union disarmament is the cornerstone of foreign policy, whilst for the United States it is only propaganda and generalizations and a means of disguising a policy aimed at pressing ahead with its plans to achieve military superiority and its aggressive aspirations.

The Soviet proposals and initiatives contained in the booklet point out realistic ways of solving the problems of disarmament and preserving peace on earth. This is a pivotal area for the foreign policymaking of the CPSU and the Soviet Government.

Soviet foreign policy is not made on the basis of short-term advantage, but flows from the principled essence of the Soviet social system, in which there are no classes or social groups with an interest in the arms race, and from the vital interests of the Soviet people -- who are building communism -- and objectively accords with the interests of every nation on earth. At the same time, the Military Publishing House booklet shows how the leaders of the present U.S. Administration are openly stating that the best way to secure peace is to prepare for war, and the basis of their policy is the theory and practice of force, primarily military force. According to the U.S. ruling circles, nuclear weapons are the main deterrent, that is, the main means of implementing their policy, and in certain conditions they will use them first in a war against the Soviet and the other Warsaw Pact countries.

On the basis of an analysis of a mass of actual material, the booklet "Disarmament: Who is Against It?" convincingly demonstrates that preventing a nuclear war and curbing the arms race are tasks of historic magnitude for each and all of us. The arms race must be halted and reversed. This is possible and attainable. As for the Soviet Union, it is ready to take the most radical steps in the nuclear sphere, up to and including complete nuclear disarmament, as well as partial steps aimed at containing and limiting the nuclear arms race, conforming, of course, with the principle of equality and identical security. There is no type of weapon which the USSR would not agree to ban, provided, of course, that this is done reciprocally. As the Soviet Union's approach to various arms race talks shows, it is prepared to back its principled stance with action and to translate it into concrete pledges.

In putting forward far-reaching proposals concerning the limiting and reduction of arms -- whether nuclear or conventional -- the USSR is concerned not only about its own security and that of the other socialist community states, but about all other countries' security. And this ensures that Soviet foreign policy has the support of honest people worldwide. This is the conclusion which the reader of the new Military Publishing House booklet will be impelled to draw.

DEPUTY MINISTERS CONDEMN GRENADA INTERVENTION

LD280751 Moscow TASS in English 0740 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Ulaanbaatar October 28 TASS -- Deputy foreign ministers of Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the German Democractic Republic, Kampuchea, Cuba, Laos, Mongolia, Poland, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, at their consultative meeting in Ulaanbaatar, have adopted a joint statement strongly denouncing the armed intervention of the United States and its henchmen in Grenada.

It is those who talk loudest about human rights who shamelessly violate the sacred right of the peoples -- the right to life, freedom and independent existence. The actions by the American military in Grenada confirm with fresh vigour that imperialist and other reactionary forces resort to any means to implement their sinister designs, suppress the national liberation movement and crush all the forces committed to peace, democracy and social progress.

We, participants in the meeting, the statement says, reaffirm resolute support for the just struggle of the people of Grenada and of the other peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean for their independence and sovereignty, and demand an immediate and unconditional withdrawl of the invasion force from Grenada and restoration of its state independence and sovereignty.

SOCIALIST MEDIA CONFERENCE OPENS IN HAVANA

PM201412 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Cooperation Developing"]

[Text] Havana, 19 Oct -- A conference of news and press agency chiefs from the socialist countries and a number of socialist-oriented countries has opened here. It is examining questions of developing cooperation and collaboration among them under conditions of the aggravation of the international situation brought about by the aggressive adventurist course of the U.S. and NATO leadership.

The conference participants are paying special attention to exposing the U.S. Administration's militarist policy and to highlighting the peoples' struggle against the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Europe, for the ending of the arms race, for peace and international security, and for the elimination of centers of tension in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. A report on the theme "News agencies' tasks in the struggle for peace and the peoples' sovereignty and against imperialism, particularly in Latin America and the Caribbean," was delivered at the conference by Gustavo Robreno, director general of PRENSA LATINA.

BRIEFS

CEMA STATISTICS COMMISSION MEETS -- The 41st session of the CEMA Permanent Commission on Cooperation in the Sphere of Statistics was held in Kiev. Delegations from the council member countries and from Yugoslavia took part. The attention of the commission session participants focused mainly on questions related to the further deepening and improving of the mutual exchange of statistical information among CEMA member countries, which assists the countries and bodies of the council in the implementation of the many-faceted programs of economic and scientific-technical cooperation. In particular, the commission adopted recommendations on the further improvement of statistical monitoring over specific expenditure of fuel, energy, basic raw and other materials in the economies of CEMA countries. The commission session passed in an atmosphere of friendship and complete mutual understanding. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 24 Oct 83 LD]

UN SECURITY COUNCIL DEBATE ON GRENADA REPORTED

U.S. Vetoes Resolution

LD281029 Moscow TASS in English 0800 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 28 TASS -- Most of the members of the U.N. Security Council demanded an immediate end to the armed intervention of the United States in Grenada and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the island without delay. Eleven out of the 15 members of the council voted for the draft resolution qualifying the armed invasion of Grenada as a gross violation of international law and an encroachment on the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that state.

Having found itself actually in international isolation, the United States, as a permanent member of the Security Council, resorted to its right of veto to block the resolution denouncing Washington as a criminal. Three members of the council, Britain, Togo, and Zaire, abstained, thus dissociating themselves from the U.S. flagrant adventure, clearly demonstrating Washington's cynical disregard for basic principles of international law.

The draft resolution proposed by Guyana, Zimbabwe and Nicaragua was put to the vote after a discussion in which spokesman for more than 50 countries had participated. All of them, with the exception of the accomplices in the U.S. criminal action, the reactionary regimes of a number of Caribbean island states, denounced the invasion.

This is only natural, for the bandit action, carried out by the U.S. military on the White House's order, is directed at undermining the very foundation of international relations. The Reagan administration is seeking to replace the generally accepted norms of these relations by military arbitrariness and the "law of the jungle", according to which the strongest is always right.

These attempts have been categorically dismissed at the United Nations. As was repeatedly stressed at the Security Council these days, if no resolute rebuff is given today to the United States' aggressiveness, then none of the non-aligned nations, which follows a policy against the White House's liking, will be able to feel safe.

Spokesmen for about 30 countries from every region of the world took the floor during the last day of the discussions. This demonstrated anew what profound worry had been caused universally by the perfidious attack of the United States on a sovereign U.N. member country. The invasion of Grenada has caused outrage all over the world, India's permanent representative Natarajan Krishnan stated. The nonaligned countries are particularly alarmed by this course of developments and by the far-reaching consequences of the military action against an independent state. The Nonaligned Movement has always strongly condemned the use of force and intervention in the internal affairs of other countries. It has always stood up for the right of every state to independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and also for the right of their peoples freely to choose political, economic and social systems. Armed intervention in Grenada is an obvious violation of these widely recognized principles.

The representatives of all major Latin American countries -- Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, Colombia and others -- who took part in the debates, voiced their opposition to the Pentagon's militarist actions. According to Peru's representative J. Arias Stella, the unprovoked aggression in the Caribbean is directed not only against Grenada, but also against many states in Latin America. He called on the Security Council to do everything possible to stop the aggressor.

Ecuador, said its representative M. Albornoz, stigmatises the armed action against Grenada, which has aggravated even more the tense situation in the region. The speaker demanded an immediate termination of the aggression and a return to the Grenadian people of their sovereign rights. Any imposition by force of one's orders on another country runs counter to international law, and is unjustifiable.

The voice of the biggest African states sounded firmly at the U.N. Security Council. They came forward with a principled condemnation of the United States' lawless action. Elleck K. Mashingaidze, permanent representative of Zimbabwe at the United Nations, pointed out that Grenada's territorial integrity had been rudely violated and its political independence and national sovereignty were gravely at stake. Let us not be under a misapprehension, he said, that the people of Grenada earned the wrath and hostility of its mighty neighbour because they opted for, and pursued truly independent and progressive domestic and foreign policies. The invasion of Grenada by the so-called multinational forces was executed for the sole purpose of overthrowing the government of that country, in order to replace it with a puppet regime.

The Zimbabwean delegate pointed out that the invasion which was masterminded, planned, financed and executed by a super-power and a permanent member of the Security Council was a shameless breach of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The reasons adduced by the aggressors in a vain attempt to justify the invasion of Grenada must be categorically rejected. Grenada has never posed a threat to the security of any country whatsoever whether within the Carribbean region or outside it.

Angola's representative Elisio de Figueiredo, denouncing the attack on the defenceless country, noted that it reveals once again the essence of the imperialist policy of the United States, be it in Latin America, or in Africa, where it openly backs the South African occupiers who have seized part of Angolan territory. The intervention confirmed the fears, repeatedly voiced by small countries, that none of them may feel safe in face of the threat from imperialism, especially in the regions with a long record of U.S. interference and intervention in the affairs of other nations.

According to Benin's representative S.I. Ogouma, the armed aggression against the tiny nation is nothing but manifestation of the "gunboat diplomacy" employed by the United States in its neo-colonialist policies. This action seriously jeopardises the peace and security in the Caribbean. Can it be that the whole community of nations is witnessing the realisation of the first phase of the plan which provides for seizure of other countries in the region as well? Zambia's delegate Paul Lusaka stressed that it is impossible to justify the aggression launched by the United States and its Caribbean satellites. The Zambian Government rejects the use of force in international relations.

Clovis Maksoud [TASS spelling], permanent observer of the League of Arab States (LAS), described the U.S. invasion as a threat to the stabilisation of the situation in many areas of the world. Speaking on behalf of the LAS which unites more than twenty nations, he pointed out that one should not put up with attempts at discarding the well-established principles of international law.

Mohammad Zarif, representative of Afghanistan, qualified the attack on the small Caribbean state as a disgusting act of lawlessness.

The states of the socialist community have wrathfully condemned the U.S. armed aggression against Grenada. The military invasion of Grenada, Harry Ott, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the German Democratic Republic, said, is a manifestation of the global policy of confrontation and superarmaments which is being pursued by U.S. imperialism and which seriously jeopardises peace and security on earth.

At the same time U.S. aircraft carriers, provided with nuclear weapons, constantly cruise in the Caribbean and other parts of the world. Preparation for deployment of new U.S. missiles is in full swing in Europe. Those are links of the same chain.

It is quite evident, stated Bulgarian delegate Boris Tsvetkov, that the USA has decided to impose its neocolonialist will on another state contrary to the universal indignation with which the lawless action has been regarded. Imre Hollai, representative of Hungary, pointed out the futility of attempts being made by Washington to find a political or moral justification for the aggression.

Soviet permanent representative Oleg Troyanovskiy said that the international community had seen anew what an abyss there was between the rhetoric about "peace" and "morality" and the actual deeds of those who formulated the U.S. policy line in international affairs. Talk about non-aggression, freedom and democracy is falling upon us in an unending flow both in the Security Council and directly from the U.S. capital. However, "non-aggression" as Washington interprets it means intervention in the Dominican Republic, in Cuba and in other parts of the world, it means armed intervention in the affairs of Nicaragua. Apparently, only the fascist dictatorial regimes in Chile, El Salvador or the racist republic of South Africa meet the U.S. standards of "democracy."

The U.S. invasion of Grenada and the (?pitiful attempts) at justifying that invasion graphically show, the Soviet delegate continued, that the military machine of U.S. imperialism has been set going full steam, which in turn demonstrates what a dangerous situation would be created in the world if the United States achieved military superiority.

U.S. 'Aggression' Condemned

PM271204 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 83 First Edition p 5

[Special correspondent report under the general heading "Hands Off Grenada! The U.S. Brazen Aggression Under the Fire of Criticism: At the UN Security Council"]

[Text] New York, 26 Oct -- An emergency session of the UN Security Council was convened at Nicaragua's request during the night of 25-26 October. It examined the question of the invasion by troops from the United States and a number of Caribbean states of the territory of the sovereign and independent state of Grenada.

Grenada's UN representative, I. Jacobs, declared that the U.S. invasion is a flagrant violation of international rooms, the UN Charter, and the sovereignty of states and is a crude interference in the Grenadian people's internal affairs. None but Washington is to blame, he went on, for the fact that tension is at the moment growing in the Caribbean and that blood is being shed.

The speaker exposed the White House attempt to present the interventionists as some kind of "multinational force." The invading forces are 95 percent U.S. servicemen, Jacobs declared.

This aggression, the speaker went on, is the culmination of the undeclared U.S. war against Grenada, which began right after the victory of the revolution on the island. As far as Grenada is concerned, it has not threatened nor does it intend to threaten anyone; it desires to live in peace with its neighbors. Jacobs also exposed R. Reagan's false claims that the presence of U.S. Armed Forces on the island supposedly became necessary to ensure the safety of U.S. citizens.

By invading sovereign Grenada's territory, Cuba's representative declared, R. Reagan's administration has finally exposed itself as the enemy of the peoples struggling for their social and national liberation, be they in Central America, in the Near East, or in other parts of the world. The representatives of Nicaragua, Mexico, Libya, and other states also condemned the U.S. aggression.

The next target of the U.S. infantrymen, the Nicaraguan delegate, H. Tinoko, declared, could very well be the Sandinist revolution, against which Washington is waging a secret war by financing, supplying, and directing the criminal activity of counterrevolutionary terrorists.

The Soviet Union, O.A. Troyanovskiy, the USSR's permanent UN representative, declared, resolutely condemns U.S. imperialism's aggression against Grenada. The White House, the Soviet representative went on, is attempting to justify this invasion by the need to defend "freedom and democracy." What kind of democracy are we talking about? The Somosa type? The Pinochet type? With this military adventure, which has strained the situation in the region to extremes, the United States is striving to impose a pro-U.S. regime once more on Grenada and to destroy the gains of the revolution. O.A. Troyanovskiy called on the UN Security Council resolutely to condemn the U.S. intervention.

J. Kirkpatrick, the U.S. representative, tried for several hours to block the holding of the UN Security Council session. In an effort to sidetrack the Security Council away from discussion of the question of the aggression against Grenada, she not only made crude threats against Nicaragua but also attacked the procedure of the Security Council's work.

WFTU STATEMENT PROTESTS 'ATTACK' ON GRENADA

LD270749 Moscow TASS in English 0113 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Prague October 26 TASS -- The World Federation of Trade Union, speaking on behalf of its 206 million members, strongly protested against the pirasic attack on Grenada by U.S. Marines and troops of Washington's allies in the region, a statement released by the WFTU here today says.

The Reagan administration has taken this step, using the might of U.S. imperialism against a small country participating in the Nonaligned Movement. The USA tries to wipe off revolutionary achievements in Grenada. It has violated the U.N. Charter, international law and basic human reights, the statement says. The WFTU has called upon the working people and trade unions in all countries immediately to mount solidarity actions with the people of Grenada and demanded the withdrawal of all the troops invading the territory of that country.

UN DELEGATES DISCUSS DISARMAMENT ISSUES

LD271744 Moscow TASS in English 0016 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 26 TASS -- TASS correspondent Sergey Baybakov reports:

Questions of curbing the arms race, the Soviet Union's new peace proposals in this sphere are in the spotlight of the attention of the participants in the debate that is continuing in the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly (political and security issues, including the regulation of disarmament).

Concentrating the efforts to remove the threat presented for mankind by nuclear weapons it is necessary to keep in mind the danger constituted by other types of mass destruction weapons, particularly chemical weapons, the delegates stress. One of the most topical tasks of the struggle to implement concrete measures in the sphere of disarmament is to ban the use and stockpiling of chemical weapons, said Finland's representative Klaus Tornudo.

The member-states of the First Committee showed a great interest in the new peace initiative of the Soviet Union submitted for their consideration. Striving to create the most favourable conditions for the intensification of the talks aimed at curbing the arms race, the USSR representative Vladimir Petrovskiy said, the Soviet delegation now submits a proposal on the freezing of the production and deployment of chemical armaments for the period till the conclusion of an appropriate international convention. As is known, at the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament the Soviet Union tabled the draft "The Basic Provisions of the Convention on the Ban of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction." Of much importance would be the implementation of the intiative of the Warsaw Treaty member-states aimed at ridding Europe of chemical weapons, the Soviet representative said.

For the talks in the given sphere to be successful, the United States should abandon its unconstructive line, its attempts to camouflage large-scale preparations for chemical war by demagogical statements about the readiness to conduct such talks.

The constructive stand of the Soviet Union is highly assessed in the United Nations circles. At the same time it is noted that the talks on banning chemical weapons have been stalled because of the lack in the United States and its closest allies in the aggressive NATO bloc of real readiness to achieve agreement. It is noted here that Washington ignores the proposals for the resumption of the Soviet-American talks in this sphere that Washington had disrupted, and disregards the calls of the General Assembly to keep from the production of new types of chemical weapons. Thus, the United States Administration plans to spend approximately ten billion dollars for the programme of America's chemical rearming in the next few years.

UN DAY NOTED AS START OF 'DISARMAMENT WEEK'

PM251521 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "For the Sake of Peace on Earth"]

[Text] UN Day -- 24 October -- has traditionally been celebrated as the start of Disarmament Week. This is not just deeply symoblic but is also the urgent demand of the times -- to save the world from the catastrophe of war and guarantee the peoples their primary right, the right to life, for the sake of which the United Nations was created.

In the preamble to the UN Charter, which came into force October 24 1945, the peoples solemnly declared their determination to spare future generations the calamities of war. This was at a time when the ashes of the conflagration of World War II, extinguished at the cost of great human sacrifice, had not yet cooled, and when the peoples' age-old dream of peace had taken new wings.

Since then, life on our planet has undergone several changes. The dark threatening clouds of war have still not been dispersed from the political horizon. What is more, with the appearance of nuclear weapons they have become a hundred times more sinister.

The alarm sounds loud today for the fate of peace and mankind's future. The danger to peace posed by the current U.S. Administration's senseless militarist course, designed to ensure for the United States its dominating positions in the world, has become too real. As a result of U.S. imperialism's aggressive actions, tension has increased throughout the world -- in Europe, Asia, Africa, the Near East, and Central America. And, of course, the deployment on the European Continent of new U.S. missiles in addition to NATO's existing nuclear potential would have even more dangerous consequences.

"In claiming the role of arbiter of the destiny of our entire planet, the United States is striving everywhere to implant systems which suit it. And the United Nations is no exception. The United States signed its Charter which says that the duty of UN member states is to "live together, in peace with each other, as good neighbors." But in practice -- and this is another example of its hypocrisy! -- it does all it can to obstruct this. Matters have reached the point where U.S. "moralists," who are fond of discoursing (including from the General Assembly platform) on the sanctity of international commitments, are now -- with overt impudence -- flouting the elementary rules of decency by showing disrespect not only toward individual states but also toward the now most representative international organization.

Since Great October, the words "Peace and Friendship Among Peoples" have been inscribed on the banner of our socialist state. "The question of what line to follow in international affairs and in the current acute situation," stressed the recent statement by Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, "does not arise for the Soviet leadership. Our course is still aimed at preserving and consolidating peace, relaxing tension, curbing the arms race, and expanding and deepening cooperation between states. This is the immutable will of the CPSU and the entire Soviet people."

Socialism and peace are indivisible. This indisputable truth has become ever more apparent in the current troubled period for mankind. The Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries show again and again their profound dedication and loyalty to the ideals of peace and are doing all they can to save Europe and our whole planet from the nuclear threat.

The Disarmament Action Week just starting takes over from the massive antimissile demonstrations which have taken place on both sides of the Atlantic in the past week. More and more new participants -- people of various political views united by a common concern for the fate of mankind -- are reinforcing the columns of the many-thousands-strong marches in defense of peace. And the Soviet public, which fully approves and supports the socialist state's foreign policy activity, is taking an active part in the Action Week together with them.

Our peace-loving initiatives are well known. Topical, realistic, specific, and considering the interests of all countries, these initiatives meet the ardent approval of the broad international public and find a positive response among all sensible world statesmen and politicians. Through its initiatives, the Soviet Union consistently and persistently paves the way toward disarmament, which would eliminate war from mankind's life forever.

The Soviet Union's stance at the Geneva and Vienna talks is determined by this principled course of our foreign policy. And it is logically continued in the major initiatives which our country advances at the United Nations. And the Soviet Union came to the current General Assembly session with important new proposals -- to resolutely and unreservedly condemn nuclear war, to seek a nuclear weapons freeze, and to take measures to prevent the militarization of space. It is not difficult to imagine how the adoption of all these proposals would improve the political climate of our planet!

The peoples demand that the forces of militarism be stopped, detente be defended and deepened, and the material resources which are being senselessly wasted on the arms race be released for the good of all mankind.

Reason must triumph.

U.S. TRIES TO REVIVE POL POT 'CORPSE' AT UN

LD271617 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 26 TASS -- TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets reports:

The United States and its closest allies have decided anew to revitalise the corpse of the Pol Pot regime, thrown by the Kampuchean people onto the garbage heap of history long ago. To this end Washington has again imposed on the UN General Assembly a discussion of the "Kampuchean question" contrary to the will of the legitimate government of that country.

The progress made by the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea in rehabilitating the country's economy and the peaceful work of the long suffering Kampuchean people, who lived through the grim years of Pol Pot genocide, obviously displease the Reagan administration. Washington seems still to be nurturing the hope to saddle the Kampuchean people with its own mercenary puppets. Prince Norodom Sihanouk was again clowning on the rostrum of the UN General Assembly; this time he was introduced as "president of Democratic Kampuchea."

As was only to be expected from that "president", he again slandered Vietnam, the country which was the first to come to the aid of the Kampuchean people.

Addressing the General Assembly session, Lao representative Kithong Vongsai said that the discussion at the United Nations could only be viewed as gross intervention in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. It was a shame that the Kampuchean seat at the United Nations was still occupied (?not by) the legitimate representatives of the Kampuchean people but by the remnants of the barbarous Pol Pot regime only (?slightly) camouflaged as a "coalition government." The speaker [words indistinct] the considerable progress made by the people of Kampuchea in the economy, education and health care and expressed the confidence that the attempts to subvert the peaceful constructive efforts of the Kampuchean people would fail.

SOVIET DELEGATE ADDRESSES UNESCO MEETING

LD280420 Moscow TASS in English 0121 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Paris October 27 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Lopatin reports:

A general debate has opened at the current 17th session of the UNESCO general conference.

It shall be apparent to every participant in the session, from whatever country he may come, that the aims of the UNESCO can be achieved, its plans can be implemented only provided our planet is saved from nuclear war, said Viktor Stakalin, the head of the Soviet delegation, chairman of the Commission for the UNESCO Affairs, USSR deputy foreign minister.

It is for the sake of justifying the unbridled build-up of their militaristic preparations, he continued, that certain circles are fanning a war hysteria, do not stop at engineering crudest and most inhuman provications, direct acts of subversion against peace, are pursuing the policy of force and diktat, interference in the home affairs of the socialist and developing countries. This policy has generated tensions in many parts of the world -- in Europe, Asia, Africa and the Middle East. A serious threat to the sovereignty and security of the Republic of Nicaragua has emerged and tensions have aggravated in the whole of Central America. Two days ago the USA launched an act of direct unprovoked aggression against Grenada and high-handedly flouted all norms of international law. The aggression against Grenada is a challenge thrown to the entire world community. It is a serious blow to the cause of peace and international security.

A source of a special danger to universal peace, the head of the Soviet delegation stressed, are the plans for the deployment in Europe of American medium-range missiles aimed at radically changing the strategic situation in the European Continent to the detriment of the vital interests of the USSR and other socialist countries. The Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community supported by many developing states are opposing their specific and consistent line for a radical improvement of the international situation, for eliminating the threat hanging over humankind to the reckless and adventurist policy. The line pursued by the Soviet Union is an expression of the innermost strivings of the Soviet people. Symbolically, a new school year at all Soviet schools opens with a lesson on peace.

Proceeding from the UNESCO objective of strengthening peace and international security, as stated in its charter, the decisions of the sessions of the general conference and the executive council, the Soviet representative said, the Soviet delegation deemed it necessary to table for examination at the current session a number of draft resolutions on such issues as UNESCO's contribution to the cause of peace, the role of the organization in rallying public opinion for putting an end to the arms race and passing over to disarmament. We believe that it is the duty of the UNESCO, the duty of scientists, workers in culture, education and information to raise the voice of reason against the attempts at pushing the world to nuclear catastrophe, for transition to disarmament, for ensuring peace and prosperity in the world.

Prominent Greek actress, Minister of Culture and Science Melina Merkouri pointed out the solemn commitment of the UNESCO to human rights. Ranking among these rights, she said, is the right to work, the right to education, to information, to respect and dignity. But the main, fundamental right is the right to life. Isn't it clear to everyone that the continuing arms race threatens a universal war breaking out any moment? Under these conditions acting for peace is the duty of all of us, the duty of the UNESCO, which is responsible for the protection of education, science and culture. The time has come when all peoples should assume upon themselves responsibility for preserving peace and struggle in the name of human wisdom and common sense.

Humankind has now to make the crucial choice between war and peace, barbarity or culture, death or life, said Cuban minister of Culture Armando Hart. Tyrannies are prevailing in a number of areas of the world, acts of aggression are being perpetrated. The latest example is the crime perpetrated by the oligarchic U.S. Administration against Grenada, among whose victims there is also a group of Cuban specialists and workers. There is neither moral nor legal justification for the U.S. aggression. Such a crime shall not and cannot be left unpunished, the Cuban minister stressed. The international community condemns it most resolutely.

DELEGATES TO HELSINKI SECURITY CONFERENCE CITED

LD271205 Moscow TASS in English 1110 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Helsinki October 27 TASS -- The conference on measures of building up confidence and security and on disarmament in Europe (the terms of holding it are now being discussed at the preparatory meeting in the Finnish capital), opens up a new stage in the process of further development of many-sided relations between the states of the continent and is bound to promote consolidation of security both in Europe and the world as a whole. This is the opinion expressed by the participants in the Helsinki meeting.

This meeting is of great political significance, since it is bound to ensure the successful holding of such a big and representative international forum which the Stockholm conference will undoubtedly become, TASS correspondents have been told in an interview by the head of Bulgaria's delegation Ambassador Konstantin Grigorov. The peoples of Europe rightfully link great hopes with that conference, since the package of problems which the conference is to consider and resolve, including consolidation of the atmosphere of confidence, the ensuring of greater security of states, concerns above all, questions of mankind's peaceful future.

Much is being done in this direction, said Konstantin Grigorov. One of the striking confidence building measures is the Soviet Union's proposal on renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons. In Balkan countries and other regions of Europe the question of establishing nuclear-free zones is being actively discussed. All that fits into the process that was ushered in eight years ago in Helsinki, said the head of the Bulgarian delegation.

In our view, the Stockholm conference will broaden the range of this many-sided process, TASS correspondents have been told by the head of the Finnish delegation, Ambassador Matti Kahiluoto. Having adopted the concluding document of the Madrid meeting, the participating countries therefore reaffirmed their desire to continue and deepen the "the Helsinki spirit".

In conditions of the present-day international situation, continuation of the dialogue between states is the vital need, stressed Matti Kahiluoto. The aim of the Stockholm conference is to elaborate additional efficient measures pertaining to confidence and security. It is to be hoped that this will also exert and impact on negotiations in the sphere of disarmament. This is why, though the preparatory meeting in Helsinki considers in the main organizational issues, it is of great significance from the viewpoint of holding the Stockholm conference, Matti Kahiluoto said in conclusion.

BULGARIA'S ZHIVKOV SPEAKS AT SOFIA TU MEETING

LD272330 Moscow TASS in English 2230 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Sofia October 27 TASS -- Yuriy Andropov's answers to questions of PRAVDA are a vivid confirmation of the peaceful policy of the USSR and of countries of the socialist community. They reflected the constructive and businesslike approach of the Soviet Union to the continuation of the Geneva talks.

This has been pointed out by the general secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov. He spoke in Sofia today at the concluding session of the international trade union meeting-dialogue, which was attended by 108 delegates from 71 countries.

The countries of the socialist community have repeatedly announced and proved that they do not seek unilateral military superiority, Todor Zhivkov underlined. They come out for a no-first use of nuclear weapons, for the freezing of nuclear arsenals both qualitatively and quantitatively, for the prohibition of the militarisation of outer space.

Meeting's Close Noted

LD280427 Moscow TASS in English 0054 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Sofia October 27 TASS -- An international trade union meeting attended by 108 delegations from 71 countries, and representatives of international trade union and public organisations drew to a close here today.

At its concluding session the meeting unanimously passed an appeal to trade unions and working people of the world. The appeal calls for the convocation of the world trade union conference on disarmament. The document notes that trade unions will be able to attain their main mission -- to protect the interests of the working people -- only in case they make consistent efforts to ensure an enduring and just peace. "Our duty is to organize mass anti-war protests, to raise every worker to the struggle against the threat of nuclear annihilation and the backbreaking burden of the weapons race", the appeal says, in part. "Our strength lies in concerted action."

REAGAN ADDRESS SHOWS 'FRENZIED ANTICOMMUNISM'

LD280510 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0450 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Washington, 28 Oct (TASS) -- President Reagan appeared on televison with an address to the country that showed clearly that frenzied anticommunism, the gamble on crude force, and the expansion of U.S. military interference in various regions of the earth form the basis of U.S. foreign policy.

Reagan's speech was dedicated to recent events in Lebanon, where the occupationist contingent of U.S. forces is situated, and also in Grenada, a sovereign, independent state in the Caribbean Basin region that has become the victim of Washington's armed intervention. The White House chief rightly admitted that although Lebanon and Grenada "are oceans apart, the events there are closely interlinked." In fact, through the fault of U.S. imperialism and the Reagan administration, both in the Near East and in Central America blood is being shed, a most dangerous threat to universal peace is being created.

Reagan attempted to justify the right of the United States to dictate its will to the peoples of other countries with the help of military interference.

TASS: REAGAN ONCE AGAIN VIOLATES WAR POWERS ACT

LD280607 Moscow TASS in English 0501 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Washington October 28 TASS -- A resolution adopted by the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Thursday reflects the feelings of indignation at the U.S. Congress over Washington's invasion of sovereign Grenada. The resolution tells the President to comply strictly with provisions of the so-called War Powers Act.

President Reagan, by sending troops to Grenada bypassing the Congress, violated one more time not only the generally recognised norms of international law, but also American laws, specifically the War Powers Act. This act provides for advance notification of the Congress about plans to send American troops abroad for military operations, for which it is necessary to receive approval from that legislative body. Reagan preferred to "notify" the Congress only after the bandit operation was launched and was at its height.

MOSCOW: REAGAN RESPONSIBLE FOR BEIRUT DEATHS

LD272303 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] The foreign ministers of Western countries participating in the multinational force in Lebanon met today in Paris. Anatoliy Agaryshev comments:

Whatever the American Administration may say, it can't shed the responsibility for the death of those killed by the explosion at the Beirut headquarters of the Rapid Deployment Force. What sent these men to die thousands of miles away from home was the evil will of the U.S. President, who is responsible for the explosiion. Mr Reagan will have to answer that question in front of the senators on Capitol Hill and in front of the voters who will soon come to the polls.

The American President, as the facts show, has learned the old propaganda trick of giving the first, however incongruous, version of events. According to him the Soviet Union is responsible, having shot down the South Korean spyplane after the plane violated its sovereign borders. Should the U.S. President organize an intervention against Nicaragua or Grenada, as he claims, to save the so-called free world from world communism, the Soviet Union is again to blame.

Now the President claims that the Soviet Union is behind the explosion at the U.S. Army headquarters in Lebanon. That incongruous version suggested to the President by his friend, the U.S. ambassador to France, Galbraith, has been taken up by the Western press.

It's no coincidence that this version comes from the U.S. ambassador to France. The present French Government actively supports American policy and it has found itself in the same boat with the U.S. Administration. It will have to answer for the death of the French nationals in Lebanon. Here we have the outline of another large-scale provocation aimed at further escalating international tensions and stirring up anti-Soviet hysteria.

The United States restored to the same tactics when it sent the South Korean plane on a spy mission into Soviet airspace. American propaganda adopted the same tone following the attempt on the life of the pope, when it tried to represent the Turkish national and would-be assassin, Agca, as a Bulgarian agent directed from Moscow, without any ground whatsoever, as has been demonstrated in court now.

All slanderous allegations collapse in the end, but before they do, the U.S. Administration is pushing through its foul plans. It has secured the congressional approval of more military allocations, extension of the American military presence in Lebanon, and a further occupation by Israel of the south of Lebanon. If we ask ourselves who stands to benefit from the Beirut explosions, we'll have little difficulty in finding the answer. Paradoxically enough, it's the U.S. Administration that stands to benefit from them because it's already making every effort to use the incident as an excuse to meet its objective of beefing up the U.S. military presence in the Middle East. As you may know, a naval armada is already on its way to Lebanon carrying reinforcements.

The blast in Beirut also plays into the hands of the Israel aggressor, which regards the continued American military presence in Lebanon as a necessary condition for holding onto southern Lebanon. The blast is also in the interests of some circles in France which are acting now in various parts of the world, Lebanon included, as holders of the American militaristic contract. It would be reasonable to look for those responsible for the death of Americans and French nationals in Lebanon among those whose interests were promoted by their deaths, but the Reagan administration and those acting together with it have a crooked logic of their own.

The Soviet Union is not inclined to call the United States names, as opposed to the American President who declared that this country is the focus of evil. But there is no getting away from the fact that the responsibility for crimes against peace on this earth, and international security, as well as for the death of Americans in Beirut rests squarely with the American President whose evil will was the driving force behind them.

KORNILOV ASSESSES REAGAN POLICIES AT 3-YEAR MARK

LD271509 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1245 GMT 27 Oct 83

[From the "Topical Problems of International Life" program; talk by TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov: "USA -- Course of Aggression, Course of Militarism"]

[Text] First of all here are some statements taken from the American press. THE NEW YORK TIMES: Reagan has clearly and visibly demonstrated his inability to conduct foreign policy on a rational or even legal basis. THE WASHINGTON POST: As the majority of Americans suspect, the President has become addicted to a dangerous drug -- right-wing extremism.

The U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT: The U.S. intends to extend the game of military muscle all over the world on an unprecedented scale.

Each one of these statements -- and one could easily multiply the number of them -- could serve as a sort of epigraph to an analysis of the phenomena and processes characterizing the foreign policy of the present Washington administration.

In a few days, on 4 November, it will be 3 years since the head of that administration, Reagan, was elected President. With almost 75 percent of the presidential term behind us, we can draw up the results. The most accurate and exhaustive evaluation of the course being followed in international affairs by the present U.S. Administration was the chiselled formula contained in the statement by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov. To put it briefly, it is a militarist course representing a serious threat to peace. Its essence is, while not taking account of the interests of other states and peoples, to attempt to ensure for the United States the dominant position in the world.

Indeed, the military fist as the basic argument in conducting international affairs is the essence and core of Reagan's foreign policy. It is precisely indefatigable hegemonist ambitions that have determined Washington's gamble on the diktat of arms and money. The unprecedented buildup of U.S. military potential is required by militarist expansionist aims.

Recently the White House, having provoked anti-Soviet hysteria, put through Congress a military budget unprecedented in peacetime -- exceeding $280 billion. As is shown in the pamphlet entitled 1,000 Days -- Reagan's service record, published by the prestigious public organization, Americans for Democratic Action -- since 1980 U.S. military spending has grown by almost 100 percent. More and more new weapons systems are being put into production. (?They include such types) as can radically (?turn around) the concept of strategic stability and the very possibility of an effective limitation and reduction or arms.

In refusing to condemn nuclear war, Reagan's team continues to reject all peace-loving initiatives directed at ensuring reliable security of countries and peoples. It continues to block and deadlock all negotiations intended to put a brake on the crazy arms race that has gripped the world.

This applies to strategic weapons, to the demilitarization of space, to the need to ban barbarous chemical weapons, and to problems connected with stopping the conventional arms race. There is a particularly dangerous situation now emerging in Europe, where Washington intends to install its nuclear weapons near the borders of the socialist community. Using various propaganda tricks to try to hide the real aims of its aggressive policy, the U.S. ruling circles do not (?flinch) from bringing up all sorts of pseudo-radical initiatives, supposedly intended to facilitate progress at the Geneva negotiations. There is, for example, the so-called zero option, and the interim one, and some sort of updated one. The names vary, but the approach is the same: one-sided, obstructionist, and calculated to break up the negotiations. At the heart of the U.S. position, whatever propaganda buffoonery accompanies it, lies the same absolutely unacceptable, absurd premise -- that the Soviets should reduce their missiles, while the United States, on the contrary, should deploy its missiles in Western Europe; and, what is more, the United States should still have a free hand in determining the number of Pershing II missiles they will deploy on West European soil. If all this can be called a constructive attitude, then what should cynicism be called?

As Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov stressed, replying to questions from PRAVDA, as long as the United States keeps to its unrealistic, one-sided position, according to which the USSR should reduce its medium-range nuclear weapons, while the United States and its NATO allies build theirs up, one cannot, of course, count on progress at the negotiations.

Reagan's crusade is not simply an archaic phrase. It is a concentrated expression of the ideology and policy of the most aggressive and reactionary circles of U.S. imperialism. He began this crusade primarily against socialism, but at the same time it is aimed against all freedom-loving people and everything progressive that exists in the world today. It is a question of a global doctrine of international banditry. It is now more than evident that the U.S. ruling circles have decided to try to push back the liberated peoples, to take away the gains they have achieved in the long, hard struggle, and to reduce to zero their role in world politics.

Military aggression and economic expansion are accompanied and strengthened by psychological aggression. The sinister alliance that has formed in the United States between arms manufacturers and manufacturers of lies has never been as active as during the Reagan administration. Official Washington is openly striving to transform the confrontation of ideas into military confrontation, and attempts to deceive people have become an inalienable, organic part of the feverish war preparations.

Having thrown aside all accepted international norms of decency, the highest U.S. officials, from the President down, are unpardonably slandering the Soviet Union, its people and policy, and the socialist way of life. We will not mention the fact that a frenzied hatred of socialism is a totally unsuitable political guide. But who is it, one asks, that is playing the role of such an international moralist, instructing everyone on how they should live, what domestic and foreign policy they should conduct? Who is it that is (?insistently) trying to raise himself up to the rank of peace-maker, who is publicizing his own adherence to democracy, to the cause of human rights and liberties? It is those people who are trying to rebuild the world to their own liking, continuing to build up the arms race, pushing the world to the brink of nuclear catastrophe, threatening to deprive millions and millions of people of their main, fundamental right -- right to life.

The West German magazine SPIEGEL recently published a cartoon in which our planet is depicted as split into two [word indistinct] shells; and at the very top are two miraculously surviving individuals exchanging opinions: (?Thank goodness) it was only a limited nuclear war. While attending to their own humanitarianism, have they not pushed the world toward such a prospect, these Washington moralists, the inventors of the cannibalistic concepts of limited, star, and other nuclear wars?

Or perhaps their so-called philanthropy is shown in the fact that Washington, as is noted in the recent Soviet Government statement, is, in effect, waging war against independent Nicaragua, the aim being to overthrow the legal government of that sovereign state. How can one reconcile the expatiations of the Washington rulers about their adherence to the ideals of freedom and democracy with the brazen, criminal U.S. aggression against Grenada? As the TASS statement stresses, by its actions toward Grenada the U.S. Government is displaying complete contempt for the generally accepted norms of international law and its trampling the lofty principles of the UN Charter in the mud. It is direct evidence of the fact that Washington, in the name of achieving its predatory aims, does not intend to take account of the right of peoples to independent development, hurling an open, brazen challenge to the will of the peoples and of world public opinion.

The banditlike attack on Grenada shows with total clarity the danger to the cause of peac and freedom posed by the course being conducted in international affairs by the present U.S. Administration.

It is visibly evident in the example of Nicaragua and Grenada what Washington's expatiations about freedom, democracy, and human rights are worth, what moral standards really guide everything there. It is clear to any unprejudiced person that freedom and democracy end for the present Washington administration at the point where the peoples break free the fetters of imperialist exploitation and stand on the path of genuinely independent development.

The world is also well aware of the value of Washington's moralizing through the atmosphere in America itself, where the Reagan team is implanting the cult of violence and kindling militarist psychosis. The people who are talking in Washington about humanitarianism are those who, having turned America into a military-police state, have created a system of legalized tyranny, and who take merciless reprisals against trade unions, throw strugglers against racial discrimination into jail, and forcibly break up mass demonstrations by the champions of peace.

Three years ago, during the presidential election campaign, the present U.S. President flooded his compatriots with a whole cascade of speeches in which Americans were promised an unprecedented economic prosperity. How did all this rhetoric turn out? The most acute crisis of the post-war period hit America at the beginning of the eighties and is today making itself felt in many leading areas of industry. The budget deficit is expected to exceed $200 billion. The army of fully and partially unemployed is approaching 18 million people. To whose benefit, one asks, is the total militarization of the country? Primarily it benefits the 75 largest corporations, which form the nucleus, the kernel, of the U.S. military-industrial complex.

The striving of U.S. imperialist circles to dominate the world is obvious; but just as obvious -- and this was stressed with all force in the statement by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov -- is that the desire of these circles and their possibilities are by no means the same thing.

No one can reverse the course of history. The USSR and the other socialist countries will live and develop by their own laws -- laws of the most progressive social system. If one takes a look at the whole varied panorama of processes and events shaking the world, it is not hard to be convinced that the further the United States and NATO pursue their aggressive course, the more resolute and firm is the rebuff given to that course by the peace-loving states and peoples. Evidence of this is the broad, active support being accorded everywhere to the peace-loving foreign policy initiatives of the Soviet Union. Evidence of this is the unprecedented scale of the antiwar, antimissile movement, which is becoming an increasingly weighty, materially palpable factor in international life. Evidence of this is also seen in the continuing failures suffered by the provocations of the Washington crusaders, and their attempts to launch lies and slanders to besmirch the USSR and to justify their own militarist schemes and actions.

Yes, there has for some time now been a big shortage of political sober-mindedness in the White House. But the thunder of militarist drums being heard from Washington is not capable of stifling the voices of sober-minded politicians in America, not to mention other countries, including in the West. All those who raise their voices against the crazy arms race in defense of peace can rest assured that it is to the achievement of precisely these aims that the policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist states is directed.

WU XUEQIAN, ILICHEV CONTINUE TALKS IN BEIJING

LD271504 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1445 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Beijing, 27 Oct (TASS) -- A conversation took place today between Wu Xueqian, member of the State Council and PRC minister of foreign affairs, and Leonid Ilichev, special USSR Government representative at the Soviet-Chinese political consultations and USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs.

During the conversation questions of Soviet-Chinese relations were discussed and also certain aspects of the international situation.

The PRC foreign minister set out the Chinese side's position on the questions discussed.

The Soviet side confirmed readiness to seek mutually acceptable, realistic ways of improving relations between the USSR and the PRC and noted the positive significance of the gradually expanding links and contacts between them.

U.S., JAPAN 'FEAR' NORMALIZATION OF USSR-PRC TIES

OW260541 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Mulatov commentary: "Who Is Afraid of the Normalization of Soviet-Chinese Relations?"]

[Text] The Soviet Union is unswervingly striving to normalize Soviet-Chinese relations, on the basis of equality and in conformity with the interests of the Soviet and Chinese people. The Soviet Union has not put forward any preconditions for normalization. As Comrade Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed in August this year, a sound development in Soviet-Chinese relations is beneficial, not only to our two countries, but undoubtedly to the international situation as a whole. In this connection, station observer Mulatov writes:

All socialist countries and well-intentioned people welcome and support the firm Soviet policy of striving to improve Soviet-Chinese relations. However, the West calumniates Soviet policy, whenever the Soviet Union puts forward a new, important proposal to normalize Soviet-Chinese relations. With the increase in Soviet-Chinese trade, and the gradual development of contacts in other fields, imperialists have stepped up their propaganda efforts to vilify our country's China policy. Why? Obviously because the West realizes that there is now in China an atmosphere which may be regarded as one in which China is willing to improve its relations with the Soviet Union. In short, the imperialists fear the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations.

Big imperialist powers fear the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations, mainly because such normalization means that socialism will be greatly strengthened and the imperialist position in the world arena weakened. This will also be conducive to strengthening the socialist foundation in China. This is precisely what the imperialists are trying to stop, which is the purpose of their propaganda campaign against our country's China policy.

It is the ruling cliques in the United States, Japan and other big imperialist countries which are calling the tune for the propaganda campaign. Former U.S. Presidents Ford and Nixon and former U.S. Secretary of State Kissinger, as well as major newspapers and magazines published in the United States and Japan, are now sparing no efforts to misinterpret the peace-loving essence of various proposals put forward by the Soviet Union on its relations with China.

They have uttered various slanders against the Soviet Union in an attempt to prove that the normalization of relations is out of the question. They have been trying, by hook or by crook, to convince people that the Soviet Union is insidious. The imperialists, enemies of the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations, have also made various promises, by alleging that cooperation with the West would bring benefits to China.

The so-called scientific predictions and theories, put forward by former masters of the White House and imperialist newspapers and magazines, can in no way disguise the grave concern of U.S. imperialism and other big imperialist powers over the prospects for the development of Soviet-Chinese relations. There are reasons for such fears: The normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations would certainly bring no benefit to imperialism, but our two countries and the whole socialist world would benefit from the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. Comrade Andropov stressed: The normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and China is assuming particular importance and urgency in the context of the current exacerbation of the international situaton. We are confident that, objectively, the Soviet and Chinese people's interests do not diverge regarding the elimination of war danger and the strengthening of peace. Even without mentioning that peace is socialism's ideal, both our countries have big long-term economic tasks, whose successful resolution requires favorable external conditions.

'OUTBURST AT MILITARIST FRENZY' IN S. KOREA VIEWED

LD071417 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Vladimir Korolev comments on the regular large-scale military exercises of the South Korean dictator regime's army:

The exercises, codenamed "Two Dragons 83" involve over 20,000 servicemen. The 40,000-strong American corps which actually occupies the south of the Korean peninsula is also alerted. Political observers stress that the choice of time for this militarist activity is noit accidental. The current South Korean maneuvers coincide in time with a succession of military exercises that various armed services of the United States and Japan are having throughout October.

It's plain evident that these activities of the Japanese and South Korea military are inspired by Washington. Their purpose is to whip up tension in the Far East what fits in [as heard] the Reagan administration's strategic plans. In the opinion of many press publications the spying mission of the South Korean Boeing, sent by American special services to Soviet airspace, served similar ends. Both Washington and Seoul have used the assassination attempt on the Seoul dictator, Chon Tu-hwan, in Burma as a pretext for intensifying tension on the Korean peninsula proper.

The current outburst of militarist frenzy that has swept South Korea is designed, in the opinion of observers, to tone down strong demands of the South Korean population that elementary human rights be ensured in the country. South Korea has launched at the same time a hostile campaign, unprecedented for its scale, against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Soldiers of the Seoul Army penetrate into the Demilitarized Zone and fire on North Korean bodyguards. American planes carry out provocative flights over the DPRK.

The KOREAN CENTRAL NEWS AGENCY of Pyongyang reports that all these provocative acts accompany the Two Dragons military exercises.

South Korea has long been turned into a stronghold of American aggressive preparations in the Far East. News agencies report that American nuclear arms are available on South Korean territory. As is known, Washington also intends to deploy neutron shells in South Korea. The Americans spare no money for the maintenance of the South Korean Army consisting of 600,000 men. All this is done for the sake of ensuring American stragegic interests. Washington is not concerned in the least about the vital interests of other peoples, peoples on the Asian Continent among others. It is obsessed with imperial ambitions. In order to translate them into reality Washington is drawing in the aggressive military alliance led by it, Seoul, and Tokyo to assign them the role of its henchmen.

As political observers believe, President Reagan's tour in November of Japan and South Korea will contribute to the realization of American militarist schemes in the Far East.

U.S. USING 'CARROT AND ST[illegible] K' POLICY IN PAKISTAN

PM270907 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Oct 83 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel A. Sevryugin article: "A Dangerous Partnership: Pakistan in U.S. Military-Strategic Plans"]

[Excerpt] Gravely concerned by the consequences of the revolutionary developments in Afghanistan and Iran, since the fall of 1979 the U.S. ruling circles have been changing tactics again with regard to Pakistan and falling over themselves to embrace President Ziaul Haq, who not so long before was refused U.S. credits in connection with the fact that Pakistan is developing its own nuclear weapons. The policy of nuclear nonproliferation, the human rights problem, and fears of arousing India's legitimate displeasure have been brushed aside in the process. These have all been sacrificed on the altar of U.S. strategic goals.

In the course of the ensuing contacts, meetings, and talks the sides have put their cards on the table. The Americans have made it plain that henceforth Pakistan is exceptionally important to them as a support base for the Afghan counterrevolution, a barrier in the way of the spread of the ideas of Iranian Muslim fundamentalists, and a springboard for the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force. As for Pakistan, it has set the U.S. Administration one condition: In return for its services it has demanded the resumption of U.S. military aid.

The Reagan administration, which entered the White House in 1981, has embarked on a more determined policy of military and political rapproachement with Islamabad. Back in December 1981 an agreement was signed to supply Pakistan with 40 of the latest F-16 warplanes, at a total cost of more than $1 billion. The U.S. Administration then earmarked $3.2 billion in military aid to Pakistan, under which it undertook to supply Cobra TOW combat helicopters, tanks, artillery pieces, antitank devices, antiship missiles, and electronic equipment. Some of these arms have already started reaching Pakistan. At the same time, the United States has increased the supply of weapons via Pakistan for the Afghan counterrevolution, which is based on Pakistani territory.

Further testimony to the far-reaching U.S. schemes to use Pakistan for its military-strategic plans is provided by the fact that it has been included in the sphere of responsibility of a new U.S. Armed Forces central joint command, which, in "crisis" situations, is to incorporate the so-called Rapid Deployment Force. The modernization of Pakistani territory's infrastructure currently underway with U.S. aid is being carried out in the interests of facilitating this force's actions.

The United States has been particularly active of late with regard to Pakistan. Since July 1983 alone Pakistan has had visits from U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz; a delegation of U.S. congressmen headed by Clarence Long, chairman of the House Foreign Operations Subcommittee; General A. Gabriel, chief of staff of the U.S. Air Force; and Defense Secretary C. Weinberger. Active consultations were held on questions relating to the two countries' cooperation in the political and military sphere during the visit to the United States by President Ziaul Haq in December 1982, Foreign Minister Yaqub Khan in May and September 1983, and other Pakistani officials.

All the U.S. officials' talks in Islamabad follow virtually the same pattern: The Americans express political support for the military regime, questions relating to U.S.-Pakistani military cooperation are discussed, and the sides coordinate policy on "the Afghan question." All this is done against a background of artificially whipped-up anti-Soviet hysteria. The U.S. delegations generally visit a training center for Afghan rebels, where there are "touching" scenes of "fraternization" between representatives of U.S. imperialism and Afghans who have been deceived and duped by counterrevolutionary propaganda.

An analysis of recent U.S.-Pakistani talks and official statements made by Washington's envoys in Pakistan points unambiguously to the fact that the United States is doing all it can to prevent a political settlement of the situation over Afghanistan. Addressing Afghan counterrevolutionaries, U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger completely excluded the possibility of such a settlement, saying that the Afghan question can only be solved militarily. In this connection he called on them to intensify subversion against the DRA and promised a substantial increase in military and material aid to the rebels, aid which already exceeds $100 million a year. This all confirms that the Reagan administration intends to continue whipping up anti-Afghan hysteria and to intensify interference, including armed interference, in the DRA's internal affairs.

The Pentagon chief's visit to Pakistan is viewed in the United States as a qualitatively new phase in relations between the United States and Pakistan in the light of the role in which the Americans cast the country in its strategic plans in the region. Weinberger went much further than previous visitors, directly raising the question of further developing U.S.-Pakistani military ties and making Pakistan firmly pro-United States on the most important questions bearing on the situation in the region.

It would appear to be no coincidence that in the region's mass media reports have appeared about U.S. plans to deploy electronic surveillance stations on Pakistani territory and to seek Islamabad's consent to the stationing of U.S. Armed Forces on its territory. It is no secret that the Americans dream of seeing the stars and stripes flying over ever more military bases in Pakistan.

Pakistan's military regime seems inclined to go even further. As pointed out by NAWA-E-WAQT, a newspaper close to the military administration, President Ziaul Haq told journalists accompanying Weinberger that "the United States can completely rely on Pakistan and, instead of relying on the Rapid Deployment Force to defend the Persian Gulf, could strengthen Pakistan, whose Armed Forces are capable of showing fine combat qualities." You could hardly put it more clearly. There's just one thing: The shah of Iran tried to assume a comparable role and everyone knows what came of that.

Pakistan's leaders are still afraid to openly embrace U.S. hawks and are maneuvering, sometimes stressing the country's attachment to the Muslim world and the Nonaligned Movement. But this does not unduly worry Washington, which understands only too well that for Islamabad military aid and the Pakistan-U.S. alliance's further deepening are much more important than keeping face with Muslims and the nonaligned countries. Washington is therefore making maximum use of the carrot and stick policy to obtain in Pakistan what it lost in Iran and to lash the Pakistani regime to the U.S. military juggernaut.

ALIYEV-LED DELEGATION ARRIVES IN VIETNAM

LD271353 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] A party and government delegation from the Soviet Union led by Comrade Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, today arrived in Hanoi on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV) Central Committee and the government of the Republic.

The delegation was met in Hanoi by Pham Van Dong, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Council of Ministers, and other officials.

Activities in Hanoi

For Vietnamese coverage of the visit to Hanoi by a USSR party and state delegation, led by CPSU Central Committee Politburo Member Geydar Aliyev, including a VNA report on a press conference given by Aliyev, see the Vietnam section of the 27 October Asia & Pacific DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

KAMPUCHEA, ANNIVERSARY OF PRC UN SEAT LINKED

LD272250 Moscow World Service in English 1531 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] On 25 October 1971 the United Nations General Assembly session approved a resolution on the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China at this international organization and on the expulsion of the representatives of Taiwan from it. Our observer Nikolay Kuzin has this to say in connection with the anniversary:

Twenty-two years had passed after the foundation of the People's Republic of China before representatives of the great Chinese people were again able to take part in the United Nations activities. Throughoug all those years, the seat of China at the United Nations had been usurped by the Kuomintang clique from the island of Taiwan. The anti-Chinese policy of the American imperialists was the reason for the abnormal situation. Representatives of the United States blocked the restoration of historic justice at the United Nations. They were dissatisfied with the social system which came into being in China after the revolution. They were irritated by the independent policies of that country. At the time, several Southeast Asian nations followed the lead of the United Nations. Finally, justice in regard to the Poeple's Republic of China triumphed at the United Nations. The Soviet Union and the other socialist states played a great role in this respect. They resolutely supported the struggle of the Chinese people for the restoration of their legitimate rights at the United Nations. American imperialists and thier allies are now preventing the People's Republic of Kampuchea from taking her legitimate seat and are turning a blind eye on the true state of affairs as they once did in the case of China.

Now they refuse to recognize that neither Pol Pot criminals nor their puppet Sihanouk represent the Kampucheans. The sole legitimate representative of the people is the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, formed in general elections. This government enjoys full support of the population and exercises control over the entire territory of the country.

This government has taken the Khmer people to the path of national rebirth. The so-called coalition formed by imperialists, and now represented at the United Nations, has no legal or moral rights to act on behalf of the people of Kampuchea. It does not control any territory, and its so-called subjects are remnants of Pol Pot bands based abroad and stained with the blood of 3 million Kampucheans. The Pol Pot butchers and their stooges have managed to keep the seat at the United Nations, which does not belong to them, only because Washington is greatly helping them as it once helped Chiang Kai-shek men. The United States wants a tense situation in Southeast Asia to step up its military presence in that part of the world. Through intrigues and maneuvering, imperialists have managed to impose anti-Kampuchean decisions on the current United Nations General Assembly session.

The ASEAN countries have joined anti-Kampuchean intrigues at the United Nations. Their resolution on the situation in Kampuchea plays into the hands of the enemies of the Kampuchean people. As on the issue of China's representation at the United Nations, under imperialist pressure, certain political circles in Southeast Asia are trying to stand in the way of historic truth and justice by their positions. We are convinced that nothing will come of it this time either. No doubt that in the long run justice will prevail. The Pol Pot men and their supporters will be driven out of the United Nations and legitimate representatives of the Kampuchean people will take their seat as legitimate representative of the Chinese people did 12 years ago.

HONECKER STATES SUPPORT FOR ANDROPOV PROPOSALS

LD280422 Moscow TASS in English 0118 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Berlin October 27 TASS -- The GDR fully supports the proposals of Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, on reaching agreement at the Geneva talks, which he set forth in the answers to questions from the newspaper PRAVDA. A statement to this effect has been made here today by Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee, chairman of the GDR State Council, at a meeting with Swedish Foreign Minister Lennart Bodstroem, who is currently on an official visit in the GDR.

The main danger to peace and life on earth stems from the plan of the USA to create in Western Europe a first strike potential through deployment there of new medium-range nuclear missiles. If things reach this point, he stressed, the states of the socialist community will be forced to take counter-measures in the interests of their security and for maintaining the military-strategic balance necessary for preserving peace.

CSSR APPEALS TO EUROPEAN PARLIAMENTS ON MISSILES

LD271516 Moscow TASS in English 1549 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Prague October 26 TASS -- The Federal Assembly of Czechoslovakia, on behalf of the Czechoslovak people, unanimously approved today an appeal to the European parliaments and their deputies. The appeal says that the implementation of NATO's plan to site new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe would have most serious consequences. A new, critical and dangerous situation would emerge. The threat of nuclear conflict would be enhanced and another spiral in the wasteful arms race would be started.

Czechoslovakia's Federal Assembly called on the European parliaments to do everything possible to prevent the stationing of new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe and come out in favour of reaching a constructive accord at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva.

JARUZELSKI, KADAR REMARKS IN WARSAW TALKS CITED

LD271236 Moscow TASS in English 1105 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Warsaw October 27 TASS -- The potitical and defensive alliance of socialist states -- the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, friendship and close cooperation with the USSR, the coordination of actions in the international arena are a true earnest of our common security, Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party (PUWP), chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic, said in a speech at a meeting with the party-and-government delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic, led by Janos Kadar, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party (HSWP), who are currently here on an official friendly visit.

The deterioration of the international situation, he pointed out, is a consequence of NATO's policy and, first of all, U.S. one aimed at upsetting the existing balance of forces, and at establishing imperialist diktat and violence. Those goals are served by the plans to deploy new U.S. missiles in Western Europe, by the armed interventions and unceasing gross interference by imperialist forces in the internal affairs of sovereign states.

The U.S. aggressive policy is countered by the socialist community's realistic program of peace and detente. The proposals, put forward in the statement of Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to curb the arms race are of major importance. The countries of the socialist community have repeatedly stated that they will not sit idle in the face of subversive actions, and will not allow NATO's unilateral military superiority. We solidarise with the reply measures of the USSR and other Warsaw Treaty member-states aimed at ensuring the security of our peoples, the Polish leader emphasized.

The major and urgent task of the peoples is to do everything possible to prevent a nuclear war, Janos Kadar said. We believe that the danger can be averted, and we are ready to do everything for that. Therefore we support the important initiatives of the Soviet Union and other states of the socialist community, which take into consideration the interests of the security of all the sides and create a basis for reaching a mutually acceptable accord. We believe that the peoples and political figures of Europe will not allow the achievements of detente to be cancelled out.

Cooperation between the HSWP and the PUWP, friendship between the two fraternal peoples serve our common interests, the strengthening of the might of socialism. Together with the Polish People's Republic and other Warsaw Treaty member states we shall continue to actively struggle for international security, for the elimination of the threat of war, Janos Kadar pointed out.

USTINOV GREETS ROMANIAN DEFENSE MINISTER OLTEANU

PM251615 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Oct 83 Second Edition p 1

[Text] To Colonel General Comrade C. Olteanu, Romanian minister of national defense

Esteemed Comrade Minister!

On behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and on my own behalf I extend to you and to all Romanian servicemen congratulations on the 39th anniversary of the Armed Forces of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

Soviet servicemen are convinced that the relations of friendship and cooperation between our armed forces will continue to develop for the good of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Socialist Republic of Romania and in the interests of all the socialist community countries.

I wish the servicemen of the Romanian Armed Forces further success in combat and political training for the sake of enhancing the defense capability of their motherland and of all the Warsaw Pact states.

With communist greetings,

Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Ustinov, USSR minister of defense

SHCHERBITSKIY RECEIVES HUNGARIAN AMBASSADOR

AU271002 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 0330 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] On 25 October, Vladimir Vasilyevich Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian communist first secretary, received Rajnai, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Hungarian People's Republic to the Soviet Union, at the latter's request, and (?Maklari), Hungarian consul general in Kiev, in connection with his return home.

Comrade Rajnai gave account of the October 1983 MSZMP Central Committee Plenum, and of the work carried out in the country to ensure that the national economic plans are fulfilled, and to improve management in the economy.

Vladimir Vasilyevich Shcherbitskiy spoke about the measures taken by the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee to implement the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums, about the socioeconomic development of the Ukrainian SSR in the 11th 5-year period, and about the accountability and election meetings held in the republic's party organizations.

In the conversation it was noted that, under the conditions of the sharply inflamed international situation, the Soviet Union, the Hungarian People's Republic, and other countries of the socialist community were strengthening joint actions in the struggle for peace, for precluding a nuclear war, for continuing and consolidating the process of detente, for checking the arms race, for security in Europe and all over the world.

The conversation was held in a warm and friendly atmosphere. Participating in it was Merkulov, department chief in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

USSR ENVOY DISCUSSES GRENADA WITH SFRY OFFICIAL

LD271609 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1247 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Belgrade, 27 Oct (TANJUG) -- Mirko Ostojic, deputy federal secretary for foreign affairs, today received the Soviet ambassador, Nikolay Rodfonov, who outlined and explained at length the Soviet view of the invasion of Grenada and the USSR's concern over the consequences this could have for the further development of events in the region.

UK FAILS TO CONDEMN U.S. 'AGGRESSION' IN GRENADA

LD280043 Moscow TASS in English 0004 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 27 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Speaking in the British Parliament yesterday, Britain's Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe refused to condemn the United States armed aggression against Grenada. Geoffrey Howe also said that Britain would not vote on the U.N. Security Council in support of the anti-American resolution in examining at the council the question of the U.S. intervention against Grenada. Such statements by the British foreign secretary at the time when American paratroopers have launched an assault against actually unarmed Grenadians is tale-telling. It is a manifestation of the fact that of greatest importance to London is bloc solidarity with the United States, but as far as the generally accepted norms of international law are concerned, this time it is ready to forget about them.

It is, certainly, not that simple to brush aside such an event as the open U.S. aggression against Grenada, which aroused a wave of indignation the world over. British Prime Minister Thatcher was quoted by the British press as expressing cautious doubt about the "advisability of the invasion" launched by the USA against Grenada, but she did not go farther than that.

Moreover British Governor-General Paul Scoon, whom London considers, as before, to be the "head of state" of Grenada, has been allowed to go aboard one of the United States ships staying in the waters of Grenada and start jointly with the U.S. command "forming" a new government for Grenada. All this is evidence of the fact that Britain has taken in the Grenadian tragedy a clearly pro-American stand. This is not fortuitious. Last year a British naval strike force landed in the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands and the United States ensured for it logistic support and cover, supplied with intelligence and even sent air force and naval units to the shores of Britain as an expression of full solidarity with the British aggression against the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands.

Today the invading American troops are dealing the peaceful Grenadian people with fire and sword, while London is, as a matter of fact, ensuring diplomatic and political cover for the Reagan administration. [Sentence as received]

Such a stand has a definite name in the history of colonialism and division of the spheres of influence between the imperialists, this is the common participation of the imperialists in the plunder and enslavement of the peoples. The actions by Washington and London in central and southern Atlantic have shown that they are birds of a feather, which according to the proverb flock together.

FRG WHITE PAPER ON SECURITY 'UNPARDONABLE LIE'

PM271039 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 83 Second Edition p 5

[Yu. Yakhontov dispatch: "Counting on Dimwits"]

[Text] Bonn, 22 Oct -- FRG Defense Minister M. Woerner presented at a press conference held here a white paper on security questions composed in his department with the blessing of the country's government.

When one familiarizes oneself with this "document" one is struck by the mass of deliberate lies about the correlation of forces in Europe and the world, and about the peace-loving initiatives of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries.

Who needs this unpardonable lie? That is quite clear. The paper has appeared at the height of the massive antimissile demonstrations in the FRG during the week of action against the deployment of the U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles.

The paper makes not even a mention of a U.S. forward-based means -- not to speak of the U.S. strategic potential -- or of the British and French medium-range missiles. Hence the categorical conclusion: "Arms upgrading is the only thing that can help the West survive." Moreover, "it will be impossible to justify" postponing deployment of the U.S. missiles until a later date in the event no results are reached in Geneva by the middle of November. Arms upgrading must follow the schedule set out for it.

The notorious white paper contains attempts to pin responsibility for the possible failure of the talks on the USSR. And here they bluntly lie to the reader by declaring that the Soviet Union opposes all measures for the monitoring of [mery kontrolya nad] arms reduction and limitation.

The paper's authors also slander their own people. Keeping silent about the fact that two-thirds of the FRG's population resolutely oppose the "arms upgrading," they launch into abuse of the antimissile movement. They assert, counting on poorly informed people, that an important question such as the use of missile weaponry will be decided jointly with the participation of the U.S. President and the leaders of the countries on whose territories the missiles are to be deployed.

In short, only a "flexible response," only "nuclear deterrence," and only the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles can, the paper's authors assert, save the "blessed West." That is the keynote of this FRG Government document, of whose contents the authors' descendants will surely be greatly ashamed.

"A model of the one-sidedness of official Bonn's policy," was the way a spokesman for the coordinating committee of the West German peace champions' movement characterized this "treatise." "The paper testifies," he said in a talk with journalists, "that the ruling circles on the Rhine fully support NATO's sinister decisions to deploy the new U.S. first-strike nuclear missile weaponry in the FRG."

E. Horn, chairman of the working group on security questions of the Social Democratic Party of Germany's parliamentary faction, declared that the word "detente" is used in the white paper purely to hide the true U.S. and NATO designs from the West German public.

GREENS IN FRG BUNDESTAG ON VISIT TO MOSCOW

To Meet Korniyenko, Zagladin

LD272346 Hamburg DPA in German 1727 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow, 27 Oct (DPA) -- The delegation of the Greens in the Bundestag, which is in Moscow for a 5-day visit, held its first talks with Soviet politicians on Thursday. The group, which includes the three parliamentary group spokesmen, Petra Kelly, Marie-Luise Beck-Oberdorf and Otto Schily, met amongst others the chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, Aleksey Shitikov. The deputies also visited the State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control, in order to learn about the level of environmental protection in the USSR.

On Friday the delegation wants to make its first review of its talks. Meetings with Georgi Korniyenko, first deputy foreign minister, and Vodin Zagladin, deputy head of the International Department of the Central Committee, are due before then.

The Greens want to speak about questions relating to securing peace and human rights. This is the first visit of a group of Green Bundestag deputies to Moscow. It is a kind of countermove to a visit to the United States in July this year.

Received by Shitikov

LD280445 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Today at the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, a talk took place with the delegation of the Greens Party of the FRG, which is in Moscow at the invitation of this committee. Comrade Shitikov, chairman of the committee, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and other representatives of the Soviet public took part in the talk on questions of the struggle against the danger of nuclear war.

On the West German side were the co-chairmen of the Greens Party faction in the Bundestag deputies, (Bastian), (Heinz) and (Khorachek) and the co-chairman of the party, Maren Grisebach.

ZAGLADIN ON FRENCH POLICY, ROLE OF PCF

PM261410 Paris LE MONDE in French 25 Oct 83 p 5

[Unattributed report: "'French Communists' Government Participation Wholly Consistent With Our Principles,' Says Mr Zagladin"]

[Text] Interviewed Sunday night, 23 October, on the RTL "Grand Jury-LE MONDE" program, Mr Vadim Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee's International Section, said concerning the French Government's stances on the Euromissiles: "I see certain contradictions in the French policy. I do not agree with the French Government's position on this subject. But that is its own affair. As far as the Communists' participation in the government is concerned, it is a matter of democratic interplay. The coalition of left-wing forces was victorious. That was very important, and still remains very important. It is a step forward."

Mr Zagladin said that relations between the Soviet and French Communist Parties "are excellent" and that Mr Georges Marchais' visit to Moscow in July "was a great success." He added: "Our parties...may adopt different positions on certain subjects. The principles remain the same; we proceed from the same principles.

"France has chosen a president," Mr Zagladin said. "We have dealings with this president. As far as the left-wing government is concerned, we greatly appreciate what it has done in domestic policy.... The French Communists' participation in the government is wholly consistent with our principles. The communists' principle is, under all conditions, to do their utmost to improve people's lives."

KOSOLAPOV LEADS CPSU DELEGATION TO FRANCE

LD272140 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] At the invitation of the leadership of the French Socialist Party, a CPSU delegation led by Comrade Kosolapov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and editor-in-chief of the journal KOMMUNIST, left by air for France today to take part in the congress of that party.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY PROTOCOL SIGNED WITH SPAIN

LD280424 Moscow TASS in English 0112 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 27 TASS -- Soviet-Spanish ties in science and technology are characterised by a specific content and dynamic development. This is the assessment given by the participants in the third session of the Soviet-Spanish commission for scientific and technical cooperation, which closed today. The session summed up the results of joint work in various fields, including basic and applied sciences, over the past two years. It was pointed out that the commission and the eight mixed working groups incorporated into it have done a considerable amount of work for the development of mutually beneficial bilateral cooperation. At the same time there are yet unused potentialities for widening the scope of joint work.

The protocol signed upon the closing of the session stressed the need for devoting much attention to such joint projects, whose results can be speedily introduced in production.

Over the time since January 1979 when the Soviet-Spanish intergovernmental agreement on scientific technical cooperation was concluded, good results have already been achieved, in particular in the coal industry. It is planned to carry out work, in cooperation with Soviet organizations, to introduce mechanisation in coal mines and the hydraulic method of coal mining in the mines of the "Hunosa" firm. There is an opportunity to use other Soviet equipment in Spanish mines.

Recently the partners signed a licence agreement on technical assistance in the introduction in the Spanish mines of Soviet methods and equipment to forecast sudden outbursts.

The potentialities are also discussed for the use of Spanish mining equipment in the USSR, joint production of equipment for the coal industry.

The next session of the Soviet-Spanish commission for scientific-technical cooperation has been scheduled to be held in Madrid next autumn.

U.S. PUBLIC'S 'ANXIETIES' OVER LEBANON CITED

PM271417 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 83 First Edition p 5

[Dispatch from own correspondent G. Vasilyev: "Ascent Into the Abyss; the U.S. Public's Anxieties"]

[Excerpt] Washington, 26 Oct -- Why are the U.S. Marines in Lebanon? What are the aims of Washington's interventionist policy in the country? Will the United States not get bogged down in the Near East and Central America like it did in the Vietnam war? These questions are now being asked not only by the relatives of those who, in accordance with the administration's wishes, have been plunged into an unjust battle, but also by many politicians, leaders of public organizations, and newspaper commentators.

Americans have heard nothing new from the White House, only the same old collection of hegemonist slogans, superficial judgments, and tiresome anticommunist cliches. President Reagan has claimed that the U.S. interventionist force in Lebanon is "defending peace" and said that if it left, a "vacuum" would arise, which would be filled by "forces hostile to the West." Americans with memories detected in the President's words echoes of propaganda excuses familiar to those from the days of the Pentagon's intervention in Southeast Asia. It was clear from the President's words that Washington not only has no plans to remove the marines from Lebanon, but, on the pretext of defending their security, intends to step up the U.S. military presence in the country.

Among other things, congressmen have learned that at the initiative of the U.S. side a conference of the foreign ministers of the United States, France, Italy, and Britain is to be held this weekend to "jointly examine the political and military situation in Lebanon." And a high-ranking U.S. mission is off to Israel the following week to discuss the same question. Newspapers are writing that Washington's diplomatic efforts are aimed at more actively involving its allies in the internationalist "peacekeeping" operations in Lebanon.

The administration's "clarifications" have only increased the critical mood on Capitol Hill. Demands for a review of U.S. policy and calls for the withdrawal of the U.S. Marines can now be heard in both houses of Congress. The sessions are extremely stormy. Robert Byrd, leader of the Democratic minority in the Senate, has said that the U.S. Government has made a gross foreign policy error by getting embroiled in Lebanon's complex internal affairs. Senator Byrd reminded people that Americans' opposition to the Vietnam war forced President Johnson to give up his plans to run again for U.S. President. He added that he sees a direct analogy between the events of 15 years ago and what is happening today. Senator Edward Kennedy urged colleagues to review the decision giving Reagan carte blanche to continue the Lebanese military adventure and to seek the earliest possible repatriation for the U.S. servicemen.

It has become known that a group of Democratic congressmen intends to force a vote in the House of Representatives on a draft resolution calling for the immediate repatriation of the U.S. Marines from Lebanon.

Events in the Near East, together with the direct U.S. intervention in Grenada, have prompted whole avalanches in newspaper commentaries and a flood of speeches. The shortest, but nonetheless memorable, speech was delivered by Congressman Sam Gibbons. "I would like to say just four words," the Florida congressman said. "Lebanon is Reagan's Vietnam."

He put into words what many Americans are now thinking. Neither the beat of military drums, the "hawks'" bellicose speeches, nor the "patriotic" waving of the stars and stripes can drown out the mounting anxiety of those who have not forgotten the lessons of history.

CPSU'S ZAGLADIN QUOTED ON MIDEAST DEVELOPMENTS

PM261208 Paris LE MONDE in French 25 Oct 83 p 5

[Unattributed report: "Zagladin: 'Multinational Forces Have Not Played Positive Role'"]

[Text] Interviewed on Sunday night, 23 October, by RTL's "Grand July" and LE MONDE, Mr Vadim Zagladin, deputy chief of the CPSU's International Section, said that the two-fold attack in Beirut -- which he described as a "tragedy" -- showed two things: "First, that a military solution of whatever kind must be ruled out, because that will lead to further tragedies; second, that the solutions proposed hitherto, starting with Camp David, via the separate agreements between Lebanon and Israel, and ending with the multinational forces, have achieved nothing. The tragedy continues. Other methods must therefore be sought. I believe -- and this is also my country's opinion -- that these methods must be political.

"We have no responsibility in all that is going on there," Mr Zagladin continued. "The only people responsible are those who initiated the aggression in this region and who are continuing this aggression.... As far as our aid to Syria is concerned, it is defensive aid. We have never done anything to provide Syria with an attacking force.... In providing this aid, we always stress, in all our conversations with the Syrian leaders, that we are in favor of a peaceful solution."

Asked whether he drew any distinction between the French and U.S. troops in Lebanon, the Soviet leader said: "There certainly is a difference, namely that the United States wants to establish itself in the region and does not conceal this intention. I have never heard such an idea voiced by France. But the multinational forces, as such, have played no positive role."

Mr Zagladin concluded on this point by observing that "Soviet participation in the solution of problems in this region (the Near East), which is very close to our borders, could be useful."

SYRIAN PRESS REPORTS ON BEIRUT BLASTS CITED

LD270109 Moscow TASS in English 1850 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Damascus October 26 TASS -- Commenting on the blasts in the territory of the main headquarters of the U.S. troop contingent and in the premises of the headquarters of the French troop contingent of the "multinational force" in Beirut, the Syrian press stresses that those events were a logical consequence of President Reagan's adventuristic course in Lebanese affairs. Newspapers point out that it was Reagan who ordered the Sixth U.S. Fleet to shell Lebanese territory and sanctioned the direct participation of U.S. Marines in recent fighting in the Lebanese mountains. Syrian newspapers say that the blasts took place against the background of a fresh escalation of tension in the region as a whole and in Lebanon in particular. That escalation was provoked by the U.S. President, who during the past few days made several threatening statements addressed to the democratic forces of Lebanon. Reagan also made threats to Syria.

The press notes the fact that the Reagan administration has empowered the command of the U.S. Marines in Lebanon to take decisions on their actions depending on the situation, that is, to commit any atrocities against the Lebanese in their own country.

A statement of Syria's official spokesman released here points out that the irresponsible allegations of the U.S. side about Damascus's involvement in the incident in Beirut are based on guesswork and have absolutely no grounds. The statement emphasizes that U.S. officials, making all sorts of insinuations about Syria, are trying to justify in the eyes of the American people their inability correctly to evaluate the situation and would like to shift responsibility for their erroneous policy in the Middle East and its pernicious consequences.

Nicosia October 26 TASS -- It is reported from Tehran that a spokesman for the Iranian Foreign Ministry rejected the charge made by U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger against the Iranian leadership, alleging Iranian involvement in blasts at the headquarters of the U.S. and French troop contingents in Beirut.

The spokesman for the Iranian Foreign Ministry said that the U.S. Administration was trying with the help of such accusations against Iran to justify the setbacks of its Lebanese policy at a time when the Lebanese people were delivering strong blows at the American and other invasion forces stationed in the country to give support to the Zionist aggression.

'SIGNS' POINT TO PERSHINGS FOR ISRAEL

PM270833 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Oct 83 p 9

["Viewpoint" article by Igor Belyayev under the rubric "International Life": "Pershings for Israel, or Who Is Threatening Whom..."]

[Text] There have been signs pointing to the appearance of U.S. Pershing-II missiles in Israel. George Ball, an assistant secretary of state in the past, has written about it in THE NEW YORK TIMES. Why do the Israeli politicians and military all of a sudden need medium-range missiles? In this connection people in Tel Aviv claim it is to repulse the Syrian threat. Over the past few months Damascus has supposedly deployed new missiles, thus allegedly creating preconditions for a change in the strategic situation in the region. Statements about a "preventive" [preventivnyy], in other words preemptive [uprezhdayushchiy], strike against Syria has been followed by the emergence of the theory about the so-called "prophylactic" [profilaktickeskiy] strike. All against the very same Syria. And it still is allegedly threatening Israel.

But let us examine the essence of what has happened. Yes, Syria did deploy new missile complexes. This fact is not concealed even by the Syrians themselves. It is, however, perfectly clear that Syria did this only in order to strengthen its air defense. As was its legitimate right. And the emergence of the new Syrian missiles was not accompanied by bellicose statements. Neither against Israel, nor against anyone else. And this, while people in Tel Aviv were openly and loudly talking about a "new war" against the Arabs. While in Israel last May, I heard such talk. Warnings about a war against Syria were voiced by Begin, the new Defense Minister Arens, the new Chief of Staff General Levi, and other Israeli politicians and military personnel.

Even then sober warning notes sounded in the deliberations by political observers, including those in Israel itself. While delivering a "preventive" or "prophylactic" strike against Syria, the Israeli Air Force could encounter resistance. What then? The "longest war" in Lebanon constantly made its presence felt and the funerals of Israeli soldiers killed on the Lebanese front are continuing. Begin's resignation answered this question. His departure was neither sensational nor unexpected for anyone who had carefully watched events in the Near East. Begin has paid harshly for the Lebanon adventure, where the Israeli army has failed to resolve even a single one of the tasks set before the incursion.

The future will show whether it will hold on to south Lebanon. And now, right at the start of the "post-Begin" era, the like-minded Shamir is raising the stakes in a game that has been lost. By demanding Pershings for Israel, he is not only fanning the arms race in the Near East but is also inviting President Reagan to sue the region for the deployment of medium-range missiles. So many temptations! Israel is the first to test the Pershings... and receives generous U.S. aid for it. It is possible to speak of the development of Israel's "strategic cooperation" with the United States. A new element in this cooperation is provided by the involvement of Israeli territory in the plans for the deployment of U.S. medium-range missile facilities. Even before several West European countries have decided to do something similar!

If we recall that the U.S. Marines, actively interfering in Lebanon's internal affairs, are already paying a terrible price for another of Reagan's adventures in the Near East -- remember the explosion at their headquarters near Beirut International Airport -- it is already possible to predict the consequences of the Pershings' appearance in Israel. This event would bring the region face to face with the real danger of a new military clash, fraught with the most dangerous consequences. Shamir is involving Israel in very dangerous missile games, since the incumbent Tel Aviv government will no longer be in control of the situation after the appearance of Pershing-2's on Israeli territory. American generals will then start to give the orders. And they do not care about Israel, any more than they care about Lebanon, where their subordinate Marines are preparing for a "hot winter."

The Near East only seems to be a region where highly complex political and other problems can be resolved by means of weapons, against the will of peoples living there and without the participation of all interested sides. Ignorance of historic dominants has already repeatedly led to sad results there.

BAGHDAD RADIO REPORTS IRAN ON 'OFFENSIVE'

PM251304 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Oct 83 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Iranian-Iraqi Conflict"]

[Text] Baghdad, 21 Oct -- Baghdad Radio has broadcast an Iranian command report starting that on the night of 20 October Iranian troops went on the offensive in the northern sector of the front with a vew to capturing the city of Panjwin. The Iraqi side is taking steps to repulse the offensive in the aforementioned area -- a mountainous locality, which inhibits the use of heavy armor and aircraft.

U.S. SEEKS TO 'SABOTAGE' NAMIBIA SOLUTION

LD230739 Moscow TASS in English 0654 GMT 23 Oct 83

["Newspaper PRAVDA: Accomplices in Sabotage" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS -- The newspaper PRAVDA, commenting on the discussion of the problem of Namibia in the U.N. Security Council recalls that U.N. Resolution 435, which envisages the withdrawal of South African occupation forces from the country and the holding of democratic elections there under international control, serves as the basis for a solution to the problem.

The Republic of South Africa, however, is stubbornly unwilling to release its hold of the mineral-rich territory. It hopes to implement its version for a settlement of the Namibian problem by debarring the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO), which has been recognised as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, from participation in a settlement of the problem. The racists want to hand over power to their puppets and thereby to keep intact military and economic positions in Namibia. For this purpose they are knocking together a puppet government from among the so-called "internal parties".

South Africa is stalling for time to prevent the United Nations organisation from playing an active role in the search for a peaceful solution to the Namibian question.

This tendency, the commentary points out, has become particularly noticeable after the U.N. Security Council has given U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar the mandate to hold consultations with all the sides concerned. The U.S.-provided idea to make a withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia dependent on a withdrawal of the Cuban contingent from Angola, turned out to be of real help to Pretoria. The government of the People's Republic of Angola, and other "frontline states" has firmly rejected the obviously unacceptable idea of "linkage". The idea has also been condemned by the U.N. secretary-general in a special report made after his recent tour of the south of Africa. However, the regime of apartheid stubbornly insists on its absurd demand. It is being actively supported by the United States which is heading the Western "contact group" which acts in the role of a go-between at the talks. Washington has declared the "Cuban factor" to be the main obstacle to the decolonisation of Namibia.

Thus, PRAVDA emphasises, the USA has actually joined in the sabotage of the world community's efforts aimed at settling the problem of Namibia.

MOSCOW MEDIA HIT U.S. ACTIVITY IN GRENADA

Reagan's Cuba Charges 'Absurd'

LD280831 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] On Grenada the populaton continues to put up resistance to the United States invaders. The main scene of fighting is the capital's airport, where reinforcement for the invaders are ariving. Units of the 82d Airborne Division, which took part in punitive operations during the United States' aggression in Vietnam, are being airlifted to Grenada from the United States. Yesterday United States aircraft and artillery bombed and shelled the island.

As United States troops continue to kill civilians on Grenada, President Reagan has made an attempt to justify the United States' aggression. In a radio and TV statement the President absurdlycharged Cuba with a wish to seize Grenada. Reagan also claimed without any grounds that United States citizens on Grenada had been jeopardized. Such claims were used as a pretext for the intrusion of thousands of United States paratroops into the island with a population of only 110,000.

As TASS notes, Reagan's statement has shown that rabid anti-communism, the use of crude force and broader military interference in various regions of the world constitute the basic principles of United States foreign policy.

American Safety 'Pretext'

LD270307 Moscow TASS in English 0133 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Washington October 27 TASS -- At a new press conference the deputy press secretary of the White House Speakes had to admit that on October 24 -- just before the aggression was started -- the U.S. received a diplomatic message from the Revolutionary Council of Grenada saying that all the U.S. citizens on the island were safe. As is known, U.S. President Reagan used the false pretext about a certain "threat", which allegedly existed in Grenada for American nationals, for "justifying" the invasion. Moreover, Speakes said that he knew nothing about any concrete and direct threats to Americans.

The statement of the deputy press secretary makes it clear that the aggression against Grenada is an operation planned beforehand. According to the representative of the White House, the U.S. Administration will decide the question on the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the island only after some time.

U.S. Playing 'Hypocrite'

LD271103 Moscow TASS in English 0917 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Washington October 27 TASS -- Washington continues to play the hypocrite, to shift and dodge in an attempt to justify the large-scale armed intervention against sovereign Grenada. This has been once again shown in all obviousness by a press conference of U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger and General John Vessey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, here. They asserted that the intervention undetaken by Washington in breach of the U.N. Charter, of the universally-recognized international norms and of the U.S. laws themselves was allegedly prompted by the need to ensure "security" and "rescue" of U.S. citizens who were in Grenada and who were ostensibly under threat. However, hardly anyone takes on trust this clumsy lie even in the United States itself. Both the President and Pentagon spokesman have repeatedly stated that nothing threatened the Americans' life on the island.

The newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES writes that there was no threat and that the occupiers conduct themselves by no means as a rescue team. The newspaper emphasizes that the Marines and the "Rangers" have been sent to Grenada to overthrow the unwelcome-to-the-USA existing system there.

'Apologia for Fist Law'

PM271256 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Belor Sturua "International Commentary": "Apologia for Fist Law"]

[Text] Aggression again. Again Marines have sallied forth from U.S. Navy ships. Again an instance of Washington's hypocrisy. This time, the mailed fist of the "world gendarme" has come down on Grenada -- a small island state in the Caribbean. The world is shocked at this high-handed, barbaric violation of international law, at this cynical flouting of all norms of civilized contacts between sovereign states.

The lower the aggressor sinks, the higher the pitch of the hypocrisy with which he is trying to justify the act of piracy, attempting to present the Jolly Roger as the lily-white banner of democracy. I am referring to U.S. President Ronald Reagan's statement at the press conference called with great urgency in the White House on the principle of "all hands on deck!"

Literally every sentence betrays arrogant disregard for both common sense and the international community. And this is no exaggeration. Let us start with the first sentence. It says that "the United States received an urgent official request from five member states of the Organization of East Caribbean States to assist collective efforts to restore order and democracy on the island of Grenada." In fact there was no such request. Washington dictated the text of the "invitation" to its satellites so as to be able to use it as a fig leaf. It was not without reason that the invading armada arrived on the spot dead on time. Unless, perhaps, the Marines use telepathy in addition to normal communication facilities? Furthermore, this can in no way be described as "collective efforts." There is only one aggressor -- U.S. imperialism. The slight "dilution" of the invading forces cannot mislead even a child. And, finally, the restoration of "order and democracy." The U.S. aggressors' past and present testify irrefutably to the fact that this is occupation and dictatorship by colonialism.

The second sentence is a second salvo of lies and falsehoods. "We have decided to comply with this request and to take part in these efforts on a multinational basis...." On the U.S. State Department's admission, the decision about the aggression was adopted several days prior to the Washington Caribbean satellites' endorsement of the "invitation to invade" in Port of Spain. And as for the "multinational basis" it is just as unsubstantiated as the "collectiveness." Both are a screen, a camouflage designed not only to conceal the grabbing hand but to add a semblance of legality to its lethal swing.

Each new sentence in the statement represents new heights of cynicism and falsehood. The President attempted to justify the banditry perpetrated in Grenada with three reasons: protection of "the lives of innocent people, including American," preventing "the worsening of chaos," and rendering assistance to the Grenadians "in restoring law and order" and "the democratic institutions."

The Americans' restlessness and wanderlust are well known. Every year millions of U.S. citizens make tourist and other trips to virtually all parts of the globe. And it was on the pretext of "concern" for them that Washington established for itself the "right" to interfere in other states' internal affairs, the right to poke its armored nose wherever it likes.

Evidently, the Pentagon is the only "travel agency" in the United States offering aggression instead of exotic delights and cannonballs instead of souvenirs. As for the law and order and, for that matter, the democratic institutions that Washington wants to restore in Grenada, they can be interpreted as the restoration of the colonial system and the conversion of Grenada into a springboard for aggression against the countries in the area which will not lie down when Washington waves its "big stick."

Sentence upon sentence. Word upon word. A concatenation of lies and hypocrisy. Crocodile tears and fixed bayonets. Reagan's lament for the tragic deaths of Grenadian statesmen and trade union figures -- the very people whom Washington smeared with slander when they were alive, who were labeled "bandits," "usurpers," "lackeys" and so forth -- is blasphemy par excellence. Why this tenderness and compassion all of a sudden?

In conclusion, the President said that since his efforts to "ease the fears and apprehension" had failed, he had "concluded that the United States had no other choice but to act vigorously and decisively." He is playing a double game here: "Fears and apprehension" for the public and "vigorously and decisively" for the Marines. Heightened rather than reduced tension in the Caribbean is what Washington sought and achieved by perpetrating its latest heinous crime -- the unprovoked aggression against Grenada...

After Reagan had read out his statement, an apologia for fist law unique even by his standards, one reporter asked him: "Mr President, are we not scattering our resources too thinly, when you consider what is happening in Lebanon?" Clearly somewhat taken aback, Reagan replied: "Now just wait a second. No we are not scattering them too thinly." But maybe you are, Mr President? Wherever the U.S. Marines put in an appearance, wherever the silhouettes of U.S. aircraft carriers and battleships pop up on the horizon, and wherever Pershing, cruise missiles and other instruments of mass destruction are being transported and assembled, Washington is "scattering" aggression and death. And no scattering -- throwing dust in people's eyes -- of demagoguery and hypocrisy is going to conceal this.

Reagan Assertions 'Mendacious'

LD271122 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2000 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Boris Andrionov commentary]

[Text] Reports coming in from abroad speak of angry indignation among the world public caused by the brigand-like armed intervention by the United States against Grenada, a small island republic in the Caribbean. Even Washington's NATO allies have not dared acquiesce to this barbaric act committed by the Reagan administration. The perfidious invasion of Grenada was made under the false pretense of the necessity of ensuring the safety of American citizens there. This is a patent lie since the Grenadian authorities gave an official assurance that there was no threat to these people on the island. Seeking to justify itself, Washington is pontificating about how its actions were supposedly dictated by the desire to reestablish law and order in Grenada and by concern for human rights.

Such statements are akin to blasphemy, a mockery of good sense, and cynical hypocrisy. In fact the Washington crusaders meant to drown in blood the right of a whole people to a free and independent existence and by force of arms to impose an order suitable to Washington in Grenada. This act of gross tyranny has again vividly shown the real value, when put to the test, of the mendacious assertions by the Reagan administration of its desire by peaceful means to solve international problems in the hotspots of our planet. The invasion of Grenada has torn away the guise of peacemaker that the White House boss had tried to assume. By deciding on this aggressive act Washington wants to intimidate other freedom-loving peoples of Latin America, and not only them.

The U.S. aggression against Grenada is an open challenge to the entire world community. By its actions the Reagan government is flouting the lofty principles of the UN Charter and is trampling underfoot the elementary norms of international law.

The present Washington claimants to the role of ruler of the fate of the world have armed their policies with state terrorism and overt international brigandage, setting them in train to achieve their selfish expansionist aims. This is witnessed by the criminal actions of Washington against Nicaragua, the Reagan administration's aggressive course in Lebanon, the U.S. undeclared war in Afghanistan and the militarist policy of the White House in many other parts of our planet.

As the TASS statement stresses, the bandit-like attack on Grenada shows with absolute clarity the danger posed to the cause of peace and the freedom of the peoples by the course being pursued in international affairs by the present U.S. Administration. Peace-loving humanity demands that the interventionist troops be withdrawn immediately from the territory in Grenada.

White House 'False Arguments'

LD272324 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 27 Oct 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] It is reported that the main center of combat activities has moved to the suburbs of the Grenada capital, St Georges. One must say that the information on the nature of these activities is quite limited. The Pentagon has not permitted a single journalist, not even an American journalist, to be present at the landing of the Marines and Rangers.

The photographs you are looking at are amateur photos taken on Grenada by American students.

The false arguments by the White House on the reasons for the armed intervention Grenada by the United States, which were hastily put together, have fallen like a pack of cards. As you already know, President Reagan stated that the allegedly most important reason for this action was the attempt by Washington to protect the lives of American citizens in Grenada. The United States has begun a demonstrative evacuation of its citizens from this island. This operation is being broadly reported by American television companies. You are seeing how American citizens, whose lives were not being threatened by anybody, have arrived in a Boeing at the military base in South Carolina.

President Reagan's lie has even been exposed by the services within his jurisdiction. According to a CBS television report, informed people from the CIA told a special commission on intelligence at the House of Representatives that they had no information on any threat to American students on Grenada or on any threat by Grenada to the security of the United States. Can such small a country as Grenada threaten such a great power as the United States? The deputy press secretary of the White House, Speakes, was also virtually obliged to acknowledge this, at a press conference for journalists. He said that on 24 October, literally on the eve of the invasion of the island by U.S. troops as well as those from several pro-American regimes of the Caribbean Basin, Washington received a diplomatic message from the Revolutionary Military Council of Grenada. It said that all American citizens of Grenada were safe. There was no threat whatsoever, writes THE NEW YORK TIMES today. The occupiers are in no way behaving like a rescue team. The Marines and special purpose troops, the Rangers, the paper stresses, were sent to Grenada in order to overthrow the objectionable regime there.

Today there was a statement by the Communist Party and Government of Cuba concerning the imperialist intervention by the United States against Grenada. This statement discloses in detail a picture of events that preceded the landing of American troops and that took place after the intervention. On the evening of 25 October, the document says, the section representing the interests of the United States in Cuba was handed a statement in which it was indicated that Cuba had done everything possible to avoid American intervention on Grenada, that not one U.S. custom, not one foreigner, had been subject to any danger and that the intervention was absolutely unjustified. The answer to this message came from the U.S. Government almost 3 days later, when the troops of the interventionists had already been attacking Cuban personnel on Grenada for more than 1 and 1/2 hours and had been landing their troops for more than 3 hours.

This is briefly the essence of the events that have taken place. However, the White House continues to openly lie, dissemble, and dodge, trying to justify the large-scale armed intervention against sovereign Grenada, the killing not only of Grenadian citizens, but also of Cuban citizens, who were giving internationalist assistance to the population of this island.

U.S. 'Language of Bullets'

LD272011 Moscow World Service in English 1530 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] On 25th October the United States-led armed intervention was launched against Grenada, a small state in the Caribbean Sea. American Marine and special task units landed in various parts of it. More from our observer (?Oleg Zhurnov):

The aggression against Grenada, into which the United States drew some Caribbean countries as well, is being carried out under the pretext of protection of foreign citizens. The false nature of this pretext is obvious since those foreigners, including Americans, who wished to leave Grenada following latest developments there, did so without difficulty. The real aim of the imperialist intervention is to hold back the revolutionary process in Grenada and once again impose a neo-colonialist domination on it.

The American imperialists usually resort to armed interference whenever they deem it necessary to reverse the march of history in Asian, African and Latin American countries. For dozens of times, they interfered with arms in Latin American countries. They waged a long but unsuccessful war against Indochina. They made a provocative attack on Iran after it had gotten rid of the pro-Western shah regime. Incidentally, taking part in the aggression against Grenada are the same American Rangers who were notorious for their atrocities in Vietnam. An American television commentator declared recently that the specter of Vietnam is again haunting the Americans. But the specter of American imperialist aggression is haunting even more the peoples of the developing countries.

The invasion of Grenada is a reminder of the pathological hatred that the American ruling quarters experience towards all the fighters for freedom and social justice in the developing countries. This hatred is especially typical of the current American Administration. President Reagan and his men condemn the Nonaligned Movement and pronounce an anathema on the liberation forces from the United Nations platform. But verbal condemnations satisfy them less and less. They resort more and more often to the language of bullets in relation to supporters of freedom and progress.

On the list of the Reagan administration are armed provocations against Libya, and armed interference in Lebanon, and now an open aggression against Grenada.

These are the latest examples of the direct use of American troops against developing and nonaligned countries. But the United States also commits crimes against developing countries through the hands of others, that is by offering training centers, weapons, instructors, and money to rightwing elements, anti-government forces, and mercenaries. This is exactly how an armed intervention in Nicaragua is being prepared today, or undeclared wars are being waged against Kampuchea and Afghanistan. A statement on the threat to sovereignty and security of Nicaragua, issued by the Soviet Government recently, points out in this connection that what we deal with is the open challenge to all the countries which jointly condemned on many occasions the policy of interference in the affairs of sovereign countries and peoples, the cynical and hegemonistic attempts to practice arbitrary rule and lawlessness in international affairs, Washington's policy and practical deeds are nothing but a crude violation of underlying principles of international law, of the United Nations Charter; and of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

Commenting on the sending of American troops to Grenada, a White House spokesman cynically referred to the region as the American backyard. This is hardly surprising, for the United States has announced vast regions, situation dozens of thousands of miles from it, as zones of its vital interests. These are the regions of the Middle East and the Indian Ocean, among others. The United States has set up the so-called Central Command, which has 19 Asian and African countries within the sphere of its operations. The ease with which the United States uses force in the arbitrarily declared zones of American interest suggests that many Asian and African countries may be confronted with a threat of an American armed interference. It's imperative therefore to launch, as early as possible, a campaign of solidarity with the people of Grenada, who have fallen victims to a murderous aggression, force the American imperialists to withdraw from that nonaligned country, and discourage them from repeating such acts of aggression in the future.

IMPACT OF GRENADA EVENTS ON WORLD VIEWED

Euromissile Issue Linked

LD271930 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 27 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

The armed intervention launched by the United States against Grenada has raised questions going beyond the framework of Washington's aggressive actions against that small country, which does not threaten anybody. The Reagan administration has again demonstrated that it is out to ensure dominating positions for the USA in the world, pursue its aggressive aims through the use of the United States Armed Forces and armaments. All this policy is a source of a threat to the whole world, to all countries. In this sense no exception is made for the states, which are linked with Washington with the bonds of alliance.

It is not fortuitious therefore that all the partners of the USA in NATO, far from supporting the U.S. aggression against Grenada, have been indirectly or directly condemned it.

Moreover, many foreign observers have extrapolated the U.S. armed brigandage against Grenada into such a key problem of the present-day international situation as the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Western Europe.

In Western Europe, the American ABC television company admits, the invasion of Grenada has increased about whether the USA can be trusted as regards the adoption of important decisions in the field of nuclear policy.

Having deadlocked the Geneva talks, Washington is stubbornly leading things to starting soon the deployment of its "Pershing" and cruise missiles in Western Europe. This deployment literally concerns matters of life and death for the European nations.

As has been shown, in particular, by the mass anti-missile actions, voices are ever more resolutely ringing out in the European Continent in warning that Washington will by no means reckon with the interests of the countries, in which the American medium-range nuclear missiles are to be deployed, that it will be guided by its militaristic ambitions.

Under these conditions one cannot help asking the question which is asked with good reason by an overwhelming majority in the European and not only in the European countries: Is there a limit before which Washington will stop not to invite for Europe the terrible tragedy of Hiroshima? Washington's adventurist policy, whose fresh manifestation is the aggression against Grenada, is another convincing proof that the USA is assigning the Europeans the role of nuclear hostages of the United States.

Nonaligned, NATO Nations React

LD272220 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Next a commentary by Leonid Levchenko on the reaction of the world public to the U.S. intervention in Grenada:

The armed intervention of the United States in Grenada has aroused a wave of indignation in all continents. Governments, statesmen, political leaders, the press, and the entire world public are denouncing the Reagan administration, which has openly embarked on the task of unbridled armed brigandry to reach its imperial aims. Units of American Marines, and a special task force of Rangers, were sent to Grenada on the false pretext of guaranteeing the security of American citizens. Later, the American State Department admitted though, that no one had threatened U.S. nationals. Washington's claims that its actions were prompted by concern for human rights were drowned in the blood of almost unarmed defenders of the island. No matter what versions and groundless reasons Washington might invent, it remains a fact that the most powerful country in the West has begun an aggression against an insular state in the Caribbean, which has the size of an American capital. This was a military move planned in advance.

The decision to begin it was made several days before Washington prompted several Caribbean nations to invite the United States to join the so-called multinational force which staged the intervention in Grenada, but it has become known that the numerically small contingent of troops from those countries arrived in Grenada over 5 hours later after the American landing, and occupied positions in the rear guard of the U.S. Marines. The purpose of the American intervention, no matter how the Reagan administration is trying to camouflage it, is to topple the social system in Grenada, impose rules suitable for Washington on the people of Grenada by force, and intimidate other freedom-loving nations in Latin America and other parts of the world.

The insolent, unprovoked attack on a small sovereign state has been condemned by such big nonaligned countries as India, Nigeria, Algeria, Mexico, and Argentina. Washington's crude violation of the UN Charter and international law is so challenging that even America's NATO partners and other allies have preferred to dissociate themselves from the gangster adventure in the Caribbean. The world thinks of the horrible consequences Washington's obsessive pursuit of the shadow [as heard] world domination can have, if it is not stopped. That is why the call is made in all continents to stop the American intervention in Grenada. The occupational troops must immediately withdraw from that independent state.

GRENADA ACTIONS PLANNED 'IN ADVANCE' BY U.S.

LD272158 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1921 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow, 27 Oct (TASS) -- TASS political observer Nikolay Chigir writes:

A clear picture of the whole process of preparations for and launching of the U.S. aggression against Grenada is emerging from the constant flow of reports from various countries of the world, above all the United States. Irrefutable evidence completely demolishes the wall of lies and falsifications behind which President R. Reagan, Secretary of State G. Chultz, Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger and other Washington officials are trying to conceal their criminal actions.

The intervention against Grenada is certainly not the result of a decision taken by the U.S. Administration at the last moment in response to a "request" from the east Caribbean countries for military interference in internal Grenadian affairs in order to restore "democracy and order" there and to "safeguard the security of U.S. citizens," as the master of the White House and members of his team ceaselessly insist. All this propaganda twaddle is a pack of lies.

The armed violence against Grenada, which as a result of the revolution of 1979 embarked on the road of independent and progressive development, was first thought up in Washington soon after the Reagan administration came to power. We will recall that as far back as 2 years ago during the "Ocean Venture-81" maneuvers and in the course of following war games, as the U.S. press openly reported, the American Marines rehearsed operations for a landing on Grenada. The Puerto Rican island of Vieques was chosen as a place for this in particular, its geographical relief being like that of Grenada's and the waters of the Caribbean that surround Grenada.

The fact that the direct American intervention against Grenada was planned in advance is also confirmed by the events directly preceding it. The armada of U.S. naval warships was directed toward the shores of the island before an emergency summit of the heads of governments of member countries of the Caribbean community took place in Port of Spain. Already then when these ships with a large contingent of marines on board and with the order to conduct operations for an incursion into Grenada, the preparation and implementation of which took place with the knowledge of the U.S. National Security Council, under the direct leadership of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were nearing their target, the decision on the "joint" anti-Grenadian action was given the stamp of approval in Port of Spain, under Washington's dictation, by pro-American puppet regimes of the east Caribbean states.

Evidence that the story about so-called "collective" actions against Grenada, which the Reagan administration is using as a fig leaf to try and disguise its brigandage, is thoroughly false also comes from this fact: U.S. troops numbering at least 3,000 officers and men landed on the island, effectively occupied it, and only then were around 300 men brought there on American combat aircraft to give the U.S. military commiting outrages on Grenada the semblance of a so-called "international force." This "Caribbean contingent" can hardly even be called an accomplice of the American interventionists. It is simply a small group of extras hired by Washington for a show staged to cover up the direct U.S. aggression.

With that aim Washington activated the machinery of its diplomatic and propaganda services to full capacity. This includes the unending series of press conferences and briefings at the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon, the intensive manipulation of members of Congress and of all U.S. public opinion, and the instructions to U.S. ambassadors in various countries of the world in which they were directed to create a smokescreen by all possible means and methods, so as to conceal Washington's true role in the organization and implementation of the bloody brigandage agianst Grenada.

But no strategems can help the Reagan Administration to conceal its true face--the face of an aggressor. No matter how much the wolf may try to dress itself up in sheep's clothing, its sinister fangs can be seen by everyone.

U.S. 'MISLEADING' PUBLIC WITH DISINFORMATION

LD280319 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1402 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Washington, 27 Oct (TASS) -- As Pentagon spokesmen have reported, the U.S. group that landed on the territory of Grenada has met up with "fierce resistance" from units of the Grenadian People's Revolutionary Army and the country's population. In Washington the losses are being carefully hushed up by being called "minimal" in order to disguise the real scale of the heroic resistance offered to the aggressors by the people of Grenada, one of the smallest countries of the Caribbean Basin.

The Pentagon has to admit that the attempt to capture this tiny island with a "blitz-strike" has been a fiasco. The military headquarters has had to send 800 more cut-throats from the 82nd U.S. Airborne Division, which is part of the Rapid Deployment Force, to "help" the Marines and the special-purpose "Rangers" units. Pentagon representatives are refusing to answer questions on how long the American occupying forces will remain in Grenada, vaguely stating that they will stay on the island until "order and democracy are fully reestablished" there. There is no need to explain what American-style "democracy" will mean for the Grenadians.

In the next few days, news agencies report, the Reagan administration intends to put in power in Grenada a puppet "government" made up of representatives of a counterrevolutionary organization called "Grenadian Democratic Movement". Paul Scoon, the British appointed governor-general of Grenada is viewed in the role of the future head of the "cabinet".

Striving to "justify" the bandit action against sovereign Grenada in some way at least the Reagan administration is clumsily twisting and turning. All sorts of briefings and press conferences are being held in Washington during which U.S. officials try to mislead the public and to put up a smoke screen around the actual events in Grenada. Congress and the diplomatic corps are being intensively worked on.

Now representatives of the administration are trying to pretend that "collective actions" by a number of East Caribbean countries are being taken against Grenada. They are not the least bit bothered by the fact that the entire "contingent" from these countries consists of barely 300 men, whereas up to 2,000 U.S. Marines and commandos landed on the island during the first phase of the invasion alone.

The soldiers from the Caribbean countries were brought to Grenada on aircraft belonging to the U.S. Air Force and they were landed on areas of the island which had already been siezed by the Americans. The White House assertions that President Reagan only decided on the invasion after he had received a corresponding request from the Organization of Eastern Caribbean states do not hold water either. In actual fact the picture is completely different. This piratical action was pre-planned by the Pentagon and the U.S. special services. The intervention against Grenada was carried out by the U.S. Armed Forces, and other countries were only drawn in as a screen.

The direct preparations for this operation were carried out with the knowledge of the National Security Council and the committee of Chiefs of Staff and a special inter-departmental operational group was set up for this. On the eve of the invasion Reagan held consultations with a number of U.S. ambassadors in order to ascertain the possibile reaction from overseas.

An intense effort was made to screen the feverish preparations for the aggression through a specially devised system of disinformation in the U.S. press.

CONTINUED RESISTANCE TO U.S. FORCES NOTED

Third Day of Opposition

LD271842 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] New American Army contigents have arrived in Grenada, which has fallen victim to U.S. aggression. These are units of the 82nd Airborne Division, notorious for punitive operations in Vietnam. For the third day the defenders of the island have been putting up resistance to the invaders. The American force of almost 3,000 men has been shelling and bombing the suburbs of the capital St Georges in an attempt to put down the resistance. In Grenada, the Soviet news agency TASS declared, the United States is trying to drown in blood the right of a whole nation to free and sovereign existence.

'Heavier' U.S. Casualties

LD272305 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1940 GMT 27 Oct 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] Washington's plans to seize Grenada speedily are meeting with failure, as can be seen from reports being received. This is clear from the reports of radio stations from the Caribbean basin countries. Grenada's Armed Forces are continuing to put up stubborn resistance to the American interventionists. The Voice of Barbados radio station reports that U.S. Marines and Rangers are making great efforts in the attempt to take Fort Frederick, which has become the main defense line of the Grenadian patriots. At the same time battles are going on in various parts of the island.

Radio Barbados reports that the U.S. intervention force has suffered heavier casualties than was expected in Washington. The aggressors did not expect such stiff resistance from the Grenadians, and are now compelled to send more contingents of their forces to the island. Today another 15 U.S. combat helicopters, based in Barbados, flew to Grenada. [video shows U.S. transport aircraft and helicopters are at airport]

More new facts are exposing the advance preparation for the U.S. aggression against Grenada. It has emerged that direct planning for the operation began a few days before the meeting of the leaders of a number of countries of the Caribbean basin and a U.S. representative in Barbados. The decision to invade was taken by the Reagan administration on 20 October, immediately following the death of Bishop, prime minister of Grenada. At that time the Pentagon announced that U.S. ships had been sent to this region from the naval base at Norfolk, Virginia.

The invasion of Grenada, the Latin American press reports, is highly reminiscent of the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965, in which subunits and units of the 82d Airborne Division, which is now being sent into the Caribbean island, also took part.

Ft Frederick Surrenders

LD280713 Moscow TASS in English 0706 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Georgetown October 28 TASS -- Fierce fighting is continuing in Grenada. According to the GUYANA NEWS AGENCY, the island's defenders put up stiff resistance to the American invaders despite their superiority in personnel, equipment and armaments. The aggressors receive massive sea and air support. According to latest reports, their numerical strength is 3,000 officers and men. The occupiers have ships shelling the island, planes and helicopters armed with missiles.

According to GNA, the U.S. troops managed to capture the main stronghold of the Grenadian Armed Forces, Fort Frederick, on Thursday after the arrival of paratrooper reinforcements. The American troops put down on the whole the resistance of the defenders in the capital. As a result of the fighting, heavy damage was inflicted to the city: the prime minister's residence, Fort Rupert and other buldings were destroyed.

The agency reports heavy losses in manpower on both sides.

The U.S. troops lost at least five helicopters during the past three days. GNA also reports that the armed contingents from the Caribbean countries including Jamaica, do not practically take part in hostilities.

After surrendering Fort Frederick, fighting men of Grenada's Revolutionary Armed Forces retreated inside the island, to the western mountainous regions. GNA agency notes the determination of the Grenadian people to continue resistance to the invading troops.

CUBAN OFFICIAL GIVES INTERVIEW ON GRENADA

PM271255 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Cuban Deputy Foreign Minister's Press Conference"]

[Text] Havana, 26 Oct -- Cuban Deputy Foreign Minister R. Alarcon has answered questions put to him at the Cuban Foreign Ministry by accredited foreign journalists. There follows the text of the questions and answers read out by R. Alarcon.

Question: Is is true that the U.S. State Department gave Cuba and the Soviet Union advance notification of the invasion of Grenada?

Answer: The United States gave notification of the invasion of Grenada several hours after our personnel working at the airport had been suddenly and perfidiously attacked.

Question: Are Cuban soldiers participating in combat action in Grenada?

Answer: There are no Cuban soldiers in Grenada. The Cuban personnel in Grenada are construction workers, doctors and other civilian specialists, and also a small group of Cuban military representatives acting as advisers to the Grenadian Armed Forces.

Question: Are there any figures on Cuban losses?

Answer: There are no precise figures on Cuban losses since we are not in contact with the places where combat action is taking place.

Question: Has the Cuban Embassy in Grenada been attacked?

Answer: The embassy has not been attacked.

Question: Is Cuba going to respond by sending troops to Nicaragua?

Answer: There is no connection between what is happening at the moment in Grenada and the situation in Nicaragua. But if Nicaragua is attacked it will be a disaster for the United States because it will be confronted by an armed people.

Question: What weapons are the Cuban construction workers in Grenada using?

Answer: The construction workers and Cuban personnel have small arms which were given to them a long time ago by Bishop so that they would be able to defend themselves in the event of outside aggression.

Question: How many Cuban construction workers are there in Grenada?

Answer: There are around 500 construction workers in Grenada.

Question: What will Cuba's reaction be?

Answer: It can be seen in the heroism with which our construction workers and other Cuban personnel are defending themselves against the treacherous attack by U.S. ground forces and Marines.

Alarcon said that the invasion of Grenada ranks with other similar U.S. interventionist operations (Guatemala in 1954, the Dominican Republic in 1964, and the aggression at Playa Giron in 1961). It is a gross violation of the norms of international law in that it is interference by one state in another's affairs by force.

'PAIN, ANGER' OF CUBANS IN ANTI-U.S. PROTEST

LD272008 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Correspondent Stanislav Kozlenko report from Havana]

[Text] To die for the homeland means to live. The heroes of Grenada are worthy of the heroes of Moncada. These and other slogans were held by the working people of Cuba who came out into the streets of Havana in protest against the U.S. aggressor's actions in Grenada. The Cuban Embassy in Grenada had reported the Cubans' last battle, which stirred the whole country.

To break the heroic resistance of the Cubans, who displayed determination and an unbreakable will in defense of the airport under construction, all the means of a U.S. Airborne division, fighter planes, helicopters, and heavy artillery and mortar fire were unleashed against them. A six-strong group of builders that was defending the Cuban flag continued fighting back until the last bullet. According to the latest reports from Grenada about 600 people are alive. The fate of more than 100 Cubans remains unknown. The anger and pain of the Cuban people came out in a wave of rallies that have taken place throughout the country. In spite of rainy weather thousands of Cubans filled the streets and squares of Havana. For the second day running workers, doctors, [word indistinct] housewives, and engineers are speaking from improvised platforms. All swear to be faithful to the international duty and to defend the revolutionary gains to the last drop of blood.

GRENADA 'DRESS REHEARSAL' FOR NICARAGUA INVASION

PM271041 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 27 Oct 83 p 3

[Article by V. Mikhaylov: "Heights of Impertinence and Cynicism"]

[Text] The R. Reagan administration, so fond of donning the garb of "peacemakers," has again demonstrated its aggressive, piratical nature toward the whole world.

The impertinent, carefully planned and prepared act of armed aggression against a small island state whose only "crime" is its independent policy is an act of international banditry.

The attempt to justify the armed invasion of Grenada has an appearance of unusual hypocrisy and cynicism even for the present White House [as published]. What is the worth of its incumbent's statements that the act of aggression was undertaken to "protect the lives of foreign citizens" and also at "the urgent official request" of a number of countries of the Caribbean Basin? The falseness of these pretexts is obvious. It is exposed not only by irrefutable facts but also by the statements of Washington's own official spokesmen.

Let's begin with "protecting the lives of foreign citizens." Was anything threatening them? Of course not. The Revolutionary Military Council which has come to power in Grenada has stated repeatedly, clearly, and specifically that it guarantees the safety of all foreign citizens in the country. In its latest message to the United States the Revolutionary Military Council, expressing its concern at aggressive U.S. preparations, stressed: "We reaffirm that the welfare and property of U.S. citizens and the citizens of other countries resident in Grenada are fully protected by our government."

The message recalled that 500 parents of U.S. students studying in Grenada had appealed to the R. Reagan administration "to refrain from hasty and provocative actions against that country." They were sure that nothing was threatening their children. The Americans on the island were also sure of this. An indicative fact:

Since the agreement reached between the Revolutionary Military Council and the British, Canadian, and U.S. officials on 23 October on the unimpeded evacuation of foreign citizens from the island, only three foreigners -- a pregnant woman and two Americans from the "Peace Corps" -- have expressed the desire to leave the island. R. Reagan's compatriots have been far more sensible than their president and his adminstration.

As for the "urgent official request" from the Caribbean countries, it is true that several days ago an extraordinary conference of the heads of government of the Caribbean community (Caricom) -- an organization consisting of 13 English-speaking Caribbean states -- was convened in Port of Spain, the capital of Trinidad and Tobago. On Washington's instructions the conference adopted two decisions -- on suspending Grenada's Caricom membership and on intervention. But a number of countries disagreed with the resolutions adopted. And Guyanese President F. Burnham stated that his country does not intend to take part in armed aggression against another member of the community. The president emphasized, absolutely reasonably, that the Guyanese Armed Forces could only form part of forces created in full accordance with UN principles.

The attempt to create a semblance of "collective" action will deceive no one. It is absolutely clear that the Reagan administration is the sole author of this bloody scenario. This was confirmed by a statement by a U.S. State Department spokesman. According to an AP report he admitted that the White House has taken the decision to carry out the piratical attack on sovereign Grenada back in the middle of last week, that is several days before the Port of Spain meeting. Reagan's fabrications thus fail to stand up to any criticism.

One more fact is indicative. It has become known that those urging on the troop contingent from the Caribbean countries which is taking part in the aggression Grenada together with 2,000 U.S. Marines included CIA agents and West German mercenaries.

Reporting the piratical U.S. attack on Grenada, many press organs note with alarm that Nicaragua and several other countries of the region may be the U.S. gangsters' next victims. "The United States," the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI writes in particular, "is seeking to turn Central and South America into its own 'inviolable zone.'" the French newspaper LE MATIN stresses that Reagan has obviously decided to do in Grenada what he so far does not dare to do in Nicaragua. Many other newspapers call the events in Grenada a "dress rehersal" for direct invasion of Nicaragua.

...Blood is being shed in Grenada. Civilians, including women, old men, and children, are dying. The U.S. Marines have organized a veritable "manhunt" for the Cuban specialists who have fulfilled their international duty in rendering selfless aid to the people of Grenada. It is indicative that the aggressors' parachute landings were made in the vicinity of the camps where the Cuban construction workers are staying.

The reasonable question arises: What can we say of the politicians holding leading posts who, while expatiating about "human rights," are prepared to drown in blood the peoples of countries pursuing an independent policy? Who, while loudly trumpeting their "loyalty to the cause of peace," commit acts of aggression against sovereign states? And who, finally, having solemnly proclaimed themselves to be "fighters against international terrorism" have gambled on terror in both their domestic and foreign policy.

The United States' perfidious, bandit action against sovereign Grenada is an impertinent challenge to the entire world community. Full responsibility for this overt act of international terrorism rests with the U.S. Adminstration and President Reagan personally.

GRENADA 'INVASION' FORESHADOWS WAR IN NICARAGUA

LD280442 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Oct 83

[From the Vremya newscast; video commentary by Igor Fesunenko: "The United States -- Terror and Violence in Central America"]

[Text] Hello, comrades!

I have here in my hands a fragment of an American bomb dropped on the Nicaraguan port of Corinto. I picked it up in this port soon after the raid. [video shows fragment of bomb, shots of cartridges] Here on the table you see spent cartridges the bullets from which hit Nicaraguan border guards, peasants, women, old men and children. I collected them there on the land which apparently had not yet cooled down from the recent battle in the settlement of El Espino on the border between Honduras and Nicaragua burned down by American hirelings.

I look on this material evidence of Washington's bloody crimes against the Nicaraguan people and recall what I saw there in Nicaragua: children whose parents had been shot by American bullets, mothers whose children had been driven away to Honduras. I recall the burned-down peasants' houses, the blown-up bridges, the burning oil which were set on fire by mercenaries who received their wages in dollars. Here are two of them who were out of luck. They were seized by fighters of the Sandinist People's Army and were photographed alongside captured material, once again American arms. Yes, the United States is waging a real, criminal, and bloody undeclared war against Nicaragua. The counterrevolutionaries who are taken prisoner speak openly about the plans for a military invasion, an invasion just as cynical and impudent as the one just carried out in Grenada. [photograph of two prisoners with U.S. arms]

I read the latest report today on the situation in Grenada [lifts the report from the table] about the atrocities by the American Marines in this country and I recall Vietnam of the sixties and early seventies. In the acts of brigandage being perpetrated by Washington in Central America, in the Near East, in Afghanistan and in other reigons of the earth one can discern the same already well-known handwriting.

There was a time when bandit actions of this kind were connected with the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. Now the masks have been cast off. The White House itself is now directing these operations which previously were shamefully entrusted to nameless, anonymous knights of the cloak and dagger. Today violence, terror and banditry have been finally elevated by the United States to the rank of state foreign policy. Not only the norms of international relations developed over centuries, not only the UN Charter, not only the treaties signed by American statesmen, but also the most elementary rules of conduct of civilized man are being flouted shamelessly and cynically.

Today the White House considers that it has the right to dispatch its troops to other countries, to overthrow governments that are not to its liking and to plant its puppets in presidential palaces.

But the more shameless and impudent imperialism is becoming, the more well-founded, the more logical appears in the eyes of the entire world the calm, sober, considered and wise position of our country which was reaffirmed in Comrade Andropove's replies to questions by PRAVDA published yesterday evening.

In these difficult days it is precisely from our position, our policy, the proposals of our country and our leadership, that ordinary people and the peoples of the planet are drawing a supply of optimism and the belief that the intrigues of the enemies of peace and mankind will be foiled.

SUPREME SOVIET DELEGATION PAYS VISIT TO BOLIVIA

Meeting With Paz Zamora

PM251303 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "On a Mutually Advantageous Basis"]

[Text] La Paz, 20 Oct -- The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by I.P. Kalin, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is here on an official visit, was received by Bolivian Vice President Jaime Paz Zamora, chairman of the National Congress.

In welcoming the Soviet guests, J. Paz Zamora underlined the enormous importance of the creation of the world's first workers and peasants state, which marked the beginning of a new era in the history of mankind and the history of the peoples' struggle for their freedom and genuine independence. For us, he noted, constant contacts and multifaceted cooperation in the political, trade, economic, and cultural spheres with the great Soviet people are of great importance. The USSR, he pointed out, builds its relations with the developing countries on an honest and mutually advantageous basis.

I.P. Kalin passed on to the Bolivian parliamentarians greetings and wishes for success from the USSR Supreme Soviet and from Yu. V. Andropov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, peronally. He spoke about the peace-loving foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Government and about the Soviet people's ardent desire to live in peace and friednship with all the peoples of the globe. A wide response, the Soviet delegation head pointed out, has been elicited by the constructive Soviet proposals aimed at preserving peace and preventing nuclear conflict, the danger of which is becoming real as a result of the aggressive policy of U.S. and NATO imperialist circles.

At the conclusion of the talk J. Paz Zamora noted that the Bolivian Government, the National Congress, and the whole people share the USSR's concern regarding the deterioration of the international situation. He especially stressed the Soviet Union's efforts to strengthen universal peace and the peoples' security. In this connection J. Paz Zamora noted the enormous importance of the new Soviet initiatives recently formulated in the statement by Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, as well as in the Soviet delegation's proposals at the 38th UN General Assembly session. These initiatives, J. Paz Zamora said, will undoubtedly be a great contribution to the cause of preventing a world war and halting the unrestrained arms race.

Meeting With President

PM251420 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Reception by President"]

[Text] La Paz, 22 Oct -- Bolivian President Hernan Siles Zuazo received a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by I.P. Kalin, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is here on an official visit. In the course of the talk questions of interest to both sides were discussed.

The Soviet delegation's leader spoke of the activity of the USSR's supreme organ of legislative power and of the Soviet Union's efforts aimed at safeguarding peace and security and at averting a nuclear catastrophe. He highly assessed Soviet-Bolivian relations, which are an example of peaceful coexistence and cooperation between states with different sociopolitical systems.

For his part, the Bolivian head of state declared that the principles of the Soviet Union's foreign policy are valued and understood by the Bolivian Government. First and foremost this concerns such global problems as the need to preserve peace on the planet, ensure international security and detente, and curb the arms race. The present government of democratic and popular unity, he noted, is making significant efforts in this direction. The president stressed that the Soviet Union and Bolivia are in complete mutual understanding in the struggle for peace and social progress.

H. Siles Zuazo highly assessed the successes achieved by the land of the Soviets in various sectors of economic, scientific, technical, social, and cultural life. He expressed the hope that the fruitful and mutually advantageous ties between the USSR and Bolivia will continue to develop.

As part of the program of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation's visit its members held meetings with representatives of the country's labor collectives and public.

SHCHERBITSKIY ADDRESSES KHARKOV AWARD CEREMONY

PM251434 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian in its 22 October 1983 First Edition carries on page 2 a 3,000-word TASS report, datelined Kharkov, 21 October, under the heading "City of Military and Labor Glory."

The report covers the 21 October Kharkov meeting at which V.V. Shcherbitskiy presented the city with the October Revolution Order and delivered a speech.

After a brief introduction, TASS continues:

"The session was addressed by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, who was warmly greeted by those present. On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers, he cordially congratulated those present and all citizens of Kharkov and veterans of the battles for Kharkov on the motherland's award and on the 40th anniversary of the city's liberation from the fascist occupiers.

"When the question of your city's award was being discussed, he said, Y.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, warmly referred to the citizens of Kharkov and highly evaluated your contribution to the cause of communist building. Yuriy Vladimirovich sends cordial greetings and best wishes to Kharkov's citizens."

The TASS report describes Shcherbitskiy's speech dealing with the city's history since October 1917 and its reconstruction after 1945, praising the city's veterans and lauding its successes in economic development, and goes on:

"The rates of economic development have been substantially accelerated this year. Industrial output valued at almost R1.5 billion has already been produced in the republic in excess of the plan for the 9 months. The state of affairs in capital construction has improved.

"This year, conditions in agriculture were highly unfavorable, especially in the southern and southeastern oblasts, where the basic grain crop areas are concentrated. This could not have failed to affect the gross grain harvest. As regards other crops, the harvest of sugar beet, potatoes, and vegetables has not been bad. More hay and haylage has been procured than last year. The republic's livestock breeders have increased animal and poultry productivity, thus making it possible to increase the procurement of meat by 124,000 metric tons, of milk by 1,179,000 metric tons, and of eggs by 357 million compared with last year."

The TASS report then covers the portion of Shcherbitskiy's speech further praising Kharkov's socioeconomic development and successes.

"Dwelling on questions of the Soviet people's communist education, V.V. Shcherbitskiy emphasized the need to step up the class tempering of young people and nurture implacability toward bourgeois ideology and firm readiness to defend the gains of socialism.

"Our people are profoundly aware that the frenzied policy of anticommunism and international provocations conducted by the incumbent White House administration and the unprecedented course of the arms race and confrontation which is being speeded up by the most aggressive U.S. and NATO circles, pose a real threat to peace.

This adventurous game with nuclear first-strike weapons, played by the United States and its allies, has caused anger and indignation among all peace-loving forces on the planet. This is why our people and all people of goodwill welcomed so warmly and with unanimous support Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's statement and the Soviet state's other proposals and actions aimed at frustrating the criminal intentions of the instigators of war.

"The progressive -- and not only the progressive -- press notes in numerous publications that the proposals put forth by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov envisage a quest for mutually acceptable solutions on an honest and just basis, solutions which do not infringe anyone's legitimate interests. This firm and constructive policy of our state is acclaimed by all progressive forces and all sober-minded people on earth.

"Today the front of the struggle against imperialism runs through the mind and heart of every Soviet person, through each workplace. Everyone at his own position must do everything possible for peace. And do it as it should be done. The better we work, the richer our country will become, the stronger its economic potential will be, and the firmer its defense capability will be. This truth is known, but that does not mean that it has become old-fashioned. It can be said without exaggeration: The struggle for peace is our discipline and organization, our selflessness in labor, our patriotism and conscientiousness."

According to TASS, Shcherbitskiy concluded his speech with praise for the Kharkov city party organization and attached the order to the city's banner. The report ends by briefly reporting the other speeches at the meeting and Shcherbitskiy's activities during his stay in Kharkov.

GRISHIN ATTENDS MOSCOW SCIENTIFIC MEETING

LD271605 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] A meeting today of the Moscow party aktiv discussed tasks of the city's CPSU organization in connection with the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers on measures to accelerate scientific and technological progress in the national economy. Moscow scientists have a large role in resolving tasks concerning the acceleration of scientific and technological progress and the formation of a unified scientific and technological policy. They perform one-third of all fundamental research and almost one-fourth of applied scientific work.

How is the labor efficiency of scientists to be raised and how is it to be linked more closely with production? These questions were at the center of the attention of the participants in the meeting today. Comrade Grishin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, read the report. The meeting drew up measures directed toward improving the efficiency of scientific research and the strengthening of links between science and production. Taking part in the meeting's work were Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Shcherbakov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Science and Educational Institutions Department; and leaders of a number of ministries and departments.

SHEVARDNADZE PRAISES SOVIET NATIONALITIES POLICY

LD271644 Moscow World Service in English 1700 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] In an interview with the Soviet newspaper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Georgian Communist Party, Eduard Shevardnadze, has called the Soviet Union a family of nationalities, each of which contributes to common prosperity and gets everything it needs for its own advancement.

Georgia is one of the 15 sovereign republics of the country. Eduard Shevardnadze used it as an example to show how republics cooperate in the economic sphere. Georgia, in the Caucasus, sends approximately one-third of its produce to other republics, and receives all necessary goods from them. As a result it is supplied with oil, iron, and many other goods it does not produce itself.

NEW KIRGHIZ CONSTRUCTION MINISTER APPOINTED

WA280800 [Editorial Report] Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian on 28 September on page 1 carries a 150-word "ukase" issued by the Kirghiz Supreme Court Presidium appointing Nasirdin Isanov as Kirghiz minister of construction. The "ukase" was signed by Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman T. Koshoyev and N. Almbekov.

BITOV MOTHER WRITES LITERATURNAYA GAZETA EDITOR

LD272017 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 27 TASS -- Olga Kedrova-Bitova, the mother of Oleg Bitov, who disappeared in Italy in September this year, has addressed a letter to Aleksandr Chakovskiy, editor in chief of the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. According to reports of foreign news agencies, Oleg Bitov is currently staying in Britain.

The letter says: "I wish to thank the Editorial Board of the LITERATURNAYA GAZATA and you personally for your assistance in the time of our grief, for the support, for the feeling of concern over the destiny of a colleague, which you have displayed.

Although I have learnt that my son is alive, yet I feel pain and alarm. I am convinced that he could not have wished to defect, that he also feels pain and alarm. I do not believe that over a month and a half my son could forget his homeland, his near and dear. What could they have done to the man so that he had lost himself? What have they done to him over these forty seven days in a foreign land? I cannot understand this, and I suffer as I do not know the truth up to now."

WEATHER CHANGE HAMPERS RESCUE OF TRAPPED SHIPS

LD251451 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Another convoy of ships rescued from their ice prison in the long strait today set course westward. The convoy was escorted to Snnikova Strait by the atomic ship "Lenin" Murmansk TASS correspondent, maintaining continual communications with the atomic ships working in the Arctic, today received a radio message from onboard the atomic icebreaker "Sibir." First Mate Gudkov reports: We have taken over 11 ships from the "Lenin" atomic ship. The comparatively favorable situation which developed in the eastern part of the Laptev Sea and which stipulated the choice of precisely this itinerary, has suddenly changed. Gale force winds descending on the Arctic coast are at times rearranging the ice fields and piling hummocks in the path of the convoy. To prevent ice pressure from crushing the motor vessel, the atomic ship is obliged to scurry alongside the convoy and continually chip out the ships. Some of them have to be towed, which delays the advance of the convoy.

Despite the surprises of the elements, the ships' crews are confident that by the October holiday this convoy, too, will break through to Murmansk. But the "Sibir," like other icebreakers, will have to mark the holiday on the Arctic vigil, for not all the motor vessels have been rescued from their ice prison.

TASS REPORTS 26 OCT LAUNCH OF COSMOS-1506

LD270958 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0852 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow, 27 Oct (TASS) -- The latest artificial earth satellite, "Cosmos-1506," the apparatus of which will continue space research, was launched from the USSR on Wednesday.

The satellite was put into orbit with the following parameters: initial period of rotation -- 104.8 minutes; maximum distance from the earth's surface -- 1,026 km; minimum distance -- 969 km; inclination of orbit -- 83 degrees.

The apparatus is operating normally.

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL PROGRESS EXAMINED

OW270517 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0940 GMT on 22 October carries the 30-minute "Political Observer's Talk" program with Lev Aleksandrovich Voznesenskiy presenting the third and final installment of a series on ways of accelerating Soviet scientific and technical progress.

Voznesenskiy beings the program by introducing an interview with Tatyana Georgiyevna Ivanova, first secretary of the Kalininskiy Raykom of Moscow City, held at the Moscow Serp i Molot Plant; the interview is titled "Reconstruction Is the Path to Efficiency." Ivanova notes the importance of reconstruction and re-equipment of enterprises in raising labor productivity as well as increasing cooperation between science and industry. She criticizes the RSFSR Ministries of Light Industry and Motor Transport for inattentiveness to the re-equipment of some of their enterprises where "prospects are not defined." Commenting on relations between science and industry, Ivanova notes that "there are no clearly defined organizational models for these interbranch relations" and urges the USSR Academy of Sciences and the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology to involve themselves in these problems.

Under the title "Knowledge and Scientific and Technical Progress," Voznesenskiy then presents an interview with academician Anatoliy Alekseyevich Logunov, rector of Moscow State University and vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Logunov notes the work being done at his university to orient students toward scientific and technical progress as well as toward the practical and applied aspects of science, citing increased cooperation with industry organizations which has led to achievements in such areas as technical fiber development and quartz synthesis. He stressed the role of education institutions in helping students foresee prospects of scientific and technical progress. Logunov also notes the necessity of students to be "armed with the Marxist-Leninist outlook" because of the "acute ideological struggle" being waged in the world.

Voznesenskiy then introduces an interview with academician Guriy Ivanovich Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology titled "Plan Plus Standards Plus Incentives." Voznesenskiy reminds viewers that in previous programs Marchuk talked about two components of scientific and technical progress -- "purposeful and programmatic planning and the system of state standards."

Replying to Voznesenkiy's question about economic incentives and scientific and technical progress, Marchuk says: "Plan plus standards are two major factors."

"The third factor is the economy -- economic challenges -- which must nudge scientific and technical progress in the necessary direction, creating not only appropriate conditions for development but also the actual development of scientific and technical progress. Innovations should promote and stimulate the development of other innovations. Herein lies the logic of scientific and technical progress.

"You are absolutely right; we have enormous possibilities here. Economic science as a whole as well as academic and industrial science must all be directed now toward finding methods of controlling the economy and controlling the development of scientific and technical progress which would enable us to most rationally and efficiently follow the path of intensifying our economy.

"It seems to me that a very large step has been made in this resolution [resolution on measures to accelerate scientific and technical progress in the national economy adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers]. It points out that in the near future, basically from the 12th 5-Year Plan period, we will move toward incentives to realize scientific and technical progress -- for instance new equipment and the latest technology -- by regulating wholesale prices.

"What does this mean? If an enterprise manufactures a certain product -- for instance, a television set, a good television set -- which meets world standards -- this is the main and necessary condition -- then, the USSR State Committee on Prices and appropriate competent bodies will grant an increase in the wholesale price up to 30 percent; that is, the price at which an enterprise transfers a product to either another enterprise or into the trade network. This means that up to 30 percent more money will go to this enterprise and will basically go toward developing production, increasing the incentive fund, and increasing cultural as well as housing construction. In other words, through this every person will experience scientific and technical progress. Although these things existed before, it has now become a system. If you reach a high technical level, you have the right to seek an increase in the wholesale price.

"Increasing wholesale prices of industrial products will, of course, under no circumstances affect consumer prices in stores, and so on. These are internal calculations between enterprises insofar as good equipment will provide greater production and thereby will cover the entire difference in raising wholesale prices, which will both provide incentives to the collective and simultaneously tighten up our production and productive forces.

"At the same time, there must also be an inverse relationship, and that is: If you produce a poor product, which you should stop producing but, through lack of preparation, are forced to continue, then you lose 30 percent of your price. You must reduce your funds, material incentives, and so on, affecting the whole collective.

"To this, I will add that not all economic incentives' problems are reflected in this resolution. You know that the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers adopted another decision prior to this resolution, a very important decision, and I think it is as significant as this one. It was on expanding the economic independence of enterprises.

"Ultimately the aim of our economy is to combine the planning factor with initiative. So, in these two resolutions, the crux is the plan and initiative, through incentives for above-plan achievements and indicators, as well as a freer management of resources obtained from each enterprise's profit for maintenance, development, reconstruction, technical re-equipment, and creating incentive funds. This is one major factor.

"However, another new, interesting factor exists for the originators of equipment -- the scientists, designers, technologists, and production men who create machines. This decision is associated with the organization and establishment of the USSR Council of Ministers' prize for particularly high achievements in creating equipment and technology. This prize amounts to R3,000-40,000. These are now incentives for collectives and for creativity in originating the best models in new equipment and technology."

Here Voznesenskiy interrupts: "The 26th CPSU Congress frankly formulated the idea that, precisely, the introduction of scientific and technical achievements into the national economy is the most decisive and acute area today."

Marchuk continues: "The introduction, or rather the utilization, of scientific and technical achievements in the national economy is, of course, a task of primary importance, and it is, in fact, central to the resolution we are discussing today.

"However, I think that there is one sphere and one indicator which, in fact, gives one the opportunity to clearly conceive the role and significance of scientific and technical progress. This is a most important indicator -- increasing labor productivity. Essentially, the welfare of society -- and this is the ultimate end for both scientific and technical progress, and for the development of our economy and state -- is based on increasing labor productivity. If we obtain more returns from the units of our labor, we will thereby create more and more material wealth.

"But how does one increase labor productivity? Many ways exist. Organizational ways, which we have discussed in the previous program. There are also technical means, without which, generally, the organizational ways could not accomplish the task. This is general mechanization and automation, but not only general. There is something new here, which perhaps not everyone has noticed. The emphasis here is on complex mechanization and automation, insofar as an additional major effect is incorporated into the complex mechanization and automation of labor.

"Let us discuss this. Imagine that we have made a tractor, and suppose the tractor costs R10,000. Take the tractor and add nothing to it. What national economic effect would the tractor bring? Nothing. Now, add a plow to that tractor, costing say R300. This is a very small addition economically, but it will now plow and perform certain kinds of beneficial work, and consequently create value. If one connects a sower, a harrow, machines for applying fertilizer, herbicides, pesticides, and so on, the whole 9 yards, or as we now say, a train of various implements, these would all take up perhaps one-tenth of the cost of the tractor. However, it would increase the initial effect by ten and perhaps a hundredfold. Here is the point. Therefore, any complex integration [kompleksnost] brings with it an additional social product. Pursue complex mechanization and complex automation, because it leads industry to the highest level of technology. This is in fact high technology, and it is the most complete use of resources and available means.

"This is such a significant resolution that the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have set a task for the entire party and people, which clears the way for us to solve the main tasks of scientific and technical progress and precisely therefore it already is, and always will be, at the center of attention of party, economic and Soviet bodies."

In conclusion, Voznesenskiy thanks Marchuk and the others taking part in the program.

INSTITUTE DIRECTOR ON ROBOTIZATION PROGRAM

PM201101 Moscow TRUD in Russian 14 Oct 83 p 2

[Interview with Doctor of Technical Sciences Professor Yevgeniy Ivanovich Yurevich, director of the Central Scientific Research and Experimental Design Institute of Robotics and Technical Cybernetics, by own correspondent A. Kozlov under the rubric "Manual Labor Borne by Machine": "Our friend, the Robot" -- first paragraph is editorial introduction -- date and place not given]

[Excerpts] For more than 10 years a special design bureau of the Leningrad M.I. Kalinin Polytechnical Institute has been the chief organization for industrial robotics in machine building. A year ago its functions were extended to all sectors of the national economy. On the basis of the special design bureau a powerful center of applied science has been created -- the Central Scientific Research and Experimental Design Institute of Robotics and Technical Cybernetics. The institute is directed by a well-known specialist in robotics in our country -- Doctor of Technical Sciences Professor Yevgeniy Ivanovich Yurevich. Our correspondent met with the institute's director and asked him to answer several questions.

Question: With such a broad program of robotization, when many thousands of "intelligent machines" are required, does it not seem that their production should be organized on a mass centralized basis?

Answer: Indeed, there are supporters of this approach to matters. However, it is incorrect in principle. The centralized manufacture of industrial robots can in no way be justified for each sector needs its own specific robotis and whole armies of robot specialists. For instance, the manipulators used in the coal industry cannot assemble clocks and watches nor gather the harvest! And this means that each sector must create and produce robots for itself. The effectiveness of this approach to matters has already been proved in practice. Robots created by specialists of the Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems are in operation at the Petrodvorets Clocks and Watches Plant, which I have already mentioned. That ministry's program for robotizing its enterprises plans to introduce more than 30,000 robots in the 11th 5-Year Plan as a whole. Similar programs currently exist in all the machine-building sectors of the country's national economy.

At first sight, putting the question this way may seem like an invitation to parochialism and unjustified duplication. In actual fact, the basis of the creation of robotics in our country was the so-called principle of standardizing the main components of robots and ensuring their centralized production.

The research conducted by our institute makes it possible to assert that the hundreds of thousands of robots required for the main spheres of production can be put together on the basis of just a few dozen types of these standardized component modules.

Question: And the last question: What difficulties are being encountered on the path of robotization?

Answer: As with every new thing, the broad introduction of robots is not a simple matter, and there are several difficulties here. I will not mention problems of a scientific and technical nature. Resolving them is a only matter of time.

Organizational problems are much more important at present Definite tactics and strategy are necessary. Moreover, experience speaks of the need for intersectorial sharing, both on a countrywide scale and within the framework of individual regions. Leningrad may serve as a good example. Back during the last 5-year plan the first regional robotics program was drafted here, pooling the efforts of more than 100 major enterprises, and by the end of the 5-year plan there will be more than 6,000.

It is a bad thing, however, that leaders are not treating this important new matter with equal interest and degree of responsibility in all sectors. Robotization questions are being resolved only slowly in the agricultural, heavy, and chemical machine-building sectors. The question of providing specialists in this comprehensive new trend in production automation is now acute. The main way to rapidly make good this shortage must be primarily to organize on a broad scale the retraining of engineering and technical cadres, who already have work experience in industry. This way has been tried out within the framework of the aforementioned regional program. For example, in Leningrad the pioneer here was the M.I. Kalinin Polytechnical Institute, where special courses for retraining engineering and technical workers in the sphere of robotics were created for the first time.

The main guidelines for the economic and social development of the USSR for 1981-1985 and the period through 1990 says: "We must develop the production and ensure the broad utilization of automatic manipulators (industrial robots) on the basis of using scientific and technical achievements." Department and ministry leaders and all of us who work in the sphere of robotics must remember these lines, which have become a law for each of us.